DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 114 916 EA 007 635

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Dunning, Bruce B.; Unger, James L. |
| TITLE | Schools' Responses to Vouchered Vocational Training: Experiences with the Portland WIN Voucher Training Program. |
| INSTITUTION | Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., Washington, D.C. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C. |
| REPORT NO | BSSR-538 |
| PUB DATE | Jul 75 |
| NOTE | 127p. |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.76 HC-$6.97 Plus Postage |
| DESCRIPTORS | Career Education; Educational Finance; *Education Vouchers; Post Secondary Education; Private Schools; *Proprietary Schools; *Public Schools; Training Allowances; *Vocational Education; *Vocational Schools; Vocational Training Centers |
| IDENTIFIERS | WIN; *Work Incentive Program |

ABSTRACT

This report presents the results of a survey of 5 public and 22 private schools in which Work Incentive Program (WIN) registrants were enrolled for vocational training during the vouchering feasibility test in Portland, Oregon. The data include the responses of school representatives to an interview schedule that asked about the schools, their operations, their reactions to the vouchering program, and, additionally, what the schools said about 146 of the 168 WIN registrants who spent their training vouchers in the schools. Pervasive differences in the responses of public and private schools were found. These differences were attributed to differences in the size, organizational structure, and training philosophies of the two categories of schools. The private schools seem to be more pragmatic in their orientation toward vocational training. The voucher system posed no particular problems for the schools, and the schools so far do not seem to have behaved unethically or in an exploitive manner with respect to vouchering. At the same time, it cannot be concluded that problems will not arise if vouchers become available on a larger scale and over a longer period of time. (Author/IRT)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

ED114916

BSSR: 538

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# SCHOOLS' RESPONSES TO VOUCHERED VOCATIONAL TRAINING: EXPERIENCES WITH THE PORTLAND WIN VOUCHER TRAINING PROGRAM

by

Bruce B. Dunning

and

James L. Unger

EA 007 635

Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc.
1990 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

July 1975

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This is one of a series of periodic reports on a study of the feasibility of the introduction into the Work Incentive Program of vouchers for skill training, funded by Grant Number 51-11-73-02 from the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor. Dr. Ann Richardson, BSSR's Study Director for the Manpower Training Voucher Project, provided general supervision for the study of schools in Portland; her knowledge of manpower vouchering and her skill as a researcher were crucial to the completion of the school study.

As is the case with virtually all social research, a great many people made essential contributions. We are indebted to Jack Newman of the Manpower Administration for his professionally informed and administratively skillful support as research monitor for the study. In the field, Thomas Dinan, Assistant Regional Director for Manpower, and Donald Stiffler of the Oregon Employment Division supported and encouraged the project. And, in Portland, we could not have functioned without the generous support and encouragement of H.E. Huggins, Director of the Portland WIN Office, and his deputies, Dennis Voeller and Richard Ackerman. The Portland WIN staff not only gave us the benefit of their extensive experience, but made us completely welcome.

At the Bureau of Social Science Research, Laure Sharp and Gene Petersen made valuable comments on the report as it was being prepared. Rick Jones and Fiona Chang contributed their considerable data-processing skills and much work. As usual, the Bureau's Production Division under Antonette Simplicio went beyond their job descriptions in putting it all

in usable form; in particular, Terri Coates, Ernestine Moore, Francys Richardson, and George Stavros not only typed the final report, but made valuable technical and editorial suggestions.

Of course our most enthusiastic thanks must go to the representatives of the various schools who took time from their busy schedules to receive us and participate in lengthy interviews. The interest and cooperation which they displayed is one measure of their dedication to improving vocational training for the benefit of all.

SCHOOLS' RESPONSES TO VOUCHERED VOCATIONAL TRAINING: EXPERIENCES WITH THE PORTLAND WIN VOUCHER TRAINING PROGRAM

## Executive Summary

### Introduction

This is a report of a survey of the schools which provided training to Work Incentive Program (WIN) participants in an exploratory program to test the feasibility of introducing a voucher system for the purchase of skill training.

Vouchering is a mechanism for modifying the relationships between public agencies and their clients by replacing the provision of goods and services in kind with a certificate or some form of authorization which will permit the client to select and "purchase" what is needed from some range of goods or services as well as from a more or less specified range of vendors. Proponents of vouchering hypothesize that its application will, on the demand side, broaden the range of services and vendors available to clients, increase chances of meeting the clients' needs adequately as they choose their own services and vendors, and enhance clients' self-esteem, sense of personal efficacy and committment by allowing them to make their own decisions. On the supplier side, it is hypothesized that vouchering will increase responsiveness to clients' needs and improve the effectiveness of services by increasing competition among vendors.

In early 1974, the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc. (BSSR), under a grant from the Manpower Administration, designed an exploratory program to test the feasibility of vouchering institutional vocational

training in WIN. The program was intended to determine the administrative feasibility of vouchering as well as to identify problems and develop procedures in a limited setting before testing the program on a larger scale. Portland, Oregon, was selected as a test site; the first of some 200 vouchers was issued in April, 1974.[1]

The vouchers issued to Portland WIN participants authorized them to purchase vocational training up to 1 year in duration from any public or private school in the metropolitan area. Training could be for any occupation and no limit was placed on cost, except that any training costing more than $2,500 had to be approved by the Regional Assistant Director for Manpower in Seattle. Trainees were to locate their own training sources and make their own arrangements for training which would lead to a reasonable expectation of employability.

In March, 1975, interviews with officials in 27 schools were conducted by the authors of this report, to determine the characteristics of the schools where vouchers were spent, identify the schools' operations and procedures relevant to the training of vouchered students, and obtain their reactions to vouchering.

A summary of the findings from this survey follows.

The Schools

The schools interviewed included public and private schools of varying sizes and degrees of specialization (Figure 1).

---

[1] Details on the development and early phases of the program will be found in Ann Richardson and Laure M. Sharp, The Feasibility of Vouchered Training In WIN: Report On the First Phase of a Study (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., December, 1974). Subsequent reports will cover analyses of data obtained from the vouchered WIN participants following their training.

ACADEMIC

Large

FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY - 1

MULTIPLE OCCUPATIONS

Large

COMMUNITY COLLEGES - 3

COMMUNITY COLLEGE BRANCH - 1

Medium

Correspondence School - 1

BUSINESS/COMMERCIAL OCCUPATIONS

Medium

Business and Secretarial Schools - 3

Business and Radio/TV Broadcasting School - 1

Commercial Art School - 1

Floral Design School - 1

Small

Business and Secretarial School - 1

Secretarial School - 1

Real Estate Schools - 2

MEDICAL AND DENTAL ALLIED OCCUPATIONS

Medium

Medical and Dental Allied School - 1

Small

Medical and Dental Allied School - 1

PERSONAL SERVICE OCCUPATIONS

Medium

Child Day Care Aide School - 1

Small

Beauty Schools - 3

Barbering School - 1

Dog Grooming School - 1

INDUSTRIAL/TRANSPORTATION OCCUPATIONS

Medium

Truck Driving School - 1

Metal Trade, Machinery Repair and Electronics School - 1

Small

Upholstering School - 1

Note: PUBLIC SCHOOLS SHOWN IN CAPITALS; Private Schools in Initial Capitals.

FIGURE 1

OCCUPATIONAL AREAS, SIZE AND PROPRIETARY STATUS OF SCHOOLS ATTENDED BY VOUCHERED WIN STUDENTS

The public-private distinction turned out to be essential on a number of dimensions. Public schools were very large, private schools were medium-sized or small. Public schools had programs relating to a number of occupations in more than one occupational field. Private schools, with one exception, had programs within one occupational field or taught the skills of a single occupation.

Concentrations of WIN students and students from other manpower training programs were very low in all but one of the public schools. In the private schools, these concentrations tended to be somewhat higher. But, even in these private schools, vouchered WIN students, for the most part, did not comprise notably large proportions of the overall student bodies.

Differences between public and private schools are not, however, confined to structural characteristics--they extend to matters of educational philosophy, perceived objectives of vocational training, and pedagogical styles. These differences and some of their consequences are addressed later in this report.

Despite the higher concentrations of manpower students in a number of the private schools, and their apparent dependence on revenues from manpower training programs in a few cases, there was little evidence that private schools exploited the shift to vouchering in WIN.

The Schools' Operations

The schools used a variety of methods to attract students. Public schools made considerably more frequent use than private schools of methods which involved direct contact with the public by school representatives. Perhaps because opportunities for exposure are more limited, the private schools more often used commercially available

means. Word-of-mouth advertising was important for the private schools and some were quite dependent on referrals by government agencies.

Only a minority of the schools had personnel who were specifically assigned to recruiting--such assignments were more prevalent among the public than among the private schools.

Almost all of the schools said they offered counseling services both prior to and during training. In the public schools, counseling usually was available on an as-desired basis while the private schools reported much more frequently that all students were counseled. But all of the public schools had formally-established, professionally-staffed counseling services, while this was seldom the case for private schools, where counseling tended to be informal and incidental to other activities. In neither case did we find much evidence to indicate consistent efforts to design training on the basis of systematic appraisal of students' needs, aspirations and abilities.

All but one of the schools said that they provided placement services for completing students. In public schools, such services were likely to include a permanent center and/or a full-time placement director and to emphasize job information services. Private schools were much less likely to have a separate placement center or a full-time placement director, and tended to emphasize contacts with employers as a means of obtaining entrance to job opportunities for their graduates.

The public and private schools differed considerably in what they felt to be the advantages and disadvantages of training offered by by their category of schools. Public schools tended to stress economy, superiority of facilities and instructional staffs, and their capability to broaden the educational backgrounds of their students. Characteristically,

the public schools reflected the orientations of professional educators. Private schools saw themselves as considerably more pragmatic in their approach to vocational training, stressing as a major advantage their ability to provide concentrated training in basic occupational skills required by employers. They also felt that they were better able to treat students as individuals and to adjust to the particular problems encountered by their clients. Schools in each class tended to mute criticism of the other class of schools, and to admit some useful role for the other. At the same time, the respondents from each class of schools quite clearly indicated a belief--which usually impressed us as sincere--that their approach to vocational training was the better.

Matching Students with Training Occupations

Increased freedom of choice is a central aspect of the vouchering concept. Those who oppose, or are skeptical of, vouchering in manpower training programs have expressed concern that schools--particularly private schools--might accept students indiscriminately with no attempt to determine whether they are qualified by background or aptitude to achieve reasonable success in the training selected. A related concern has been that schools might alter their programs solely to meet the length and cost limitations placed on the vouchers. The data from the school survey were examined for indications of the validity of such concerns.

Overall, the data suggest that private schools are somewhat more selective than public schools and somewhat more likely to take the initiative in urging changes in students' objectives to make them more consistent with demonstrated capabilities. But in neither case does

there seem to be any comprehensive, systematic effort to evaluate the appropriateness of applicants' choice of occupations and training.

In line with their open enrollment policies, none of the public schools had rejected WIN registrants seeking admission. A few of the private schools said they had done so, but the number of rejected applicants was small and the schools were unable to provide details as to the reason for rejection.

None of the public schools used tests as a general, normal means of determining whether or not applicants were qualified for entry. Educational achievement and occupational aptitude testing were available on request but were used as a screening mechanism only for a few programs where special requirements existed or where selectivity was required to avoid overcrowding of particular programs. Roughly one quarter of the private schools used occupational aptitude tests for all applicants and smaller proportions used some other type of general intelligence or educational achievement tests. In a few private schools, informal appraisals during enrollment interviews seemed to be the basis for rejection of applicants.

Despite the relative lack of systematic screening procedures, we felt that the private schools *did* make efforts to guide applicants into appropriate choices, partly because of the schools' pragmatic concern with turning out employable graduates. Public schools seemed to rely more heavily on student initiatives.

The schools felt that the students' occupational choices were appropriate in a large majority of the cases. In large part, these evaluations were made on the basis of the students' performance in

training. Most of the students whose choices were felt to be inappropriate had reportedly been given advice regarding changes.

About 8 percent of the WIN students--all in private schools--made changes in their original training choices; three-quarters of these changes were made after training had started. These changes were about evenly divided between upgradings and downgradings, usually as a result of capabilities demonstrated in training.

None of the public schools modified program length or content to accomodate voucher regulations, but such changes were made in a few cases by private schools. These changes, however, seem quite clearly to represent adaptations to the special needs of particular students rather than to the vouchering system.[2]

On balance, despite the relative lack of systematic selection, we do not feel that there is much basis for concern about widespread exploitation of the voucher program or voucher students. Despite the general absence of formal screening procedures, there is evidence of informal adjustment to the students' needs and capabilities, particularly in the private schools.

The Schools' View of Vouchered Students

Vouchered students were enrolled in some 40 training occupations. The largest number were enrolled for training in clerical occupations, with professional and technical occupations next in frequency. Together, these groups of occupations accounted for two thirds of the students.

[2]Information from sources other than the schools indicates that there were some additional students enrolled in training programs which exceeded the one-year limit. The excess time, however, was financed by the students or was at no cost to WIN.

By and large, school officials seemed to hold good opinions of the vouchered students. They felt that most of these students were in the right place for their training. A majority of the vouchered students were evaluated as average or above on class performance and substantial proportions of those for whom we have individual data were similarly evaluated on aptitude, attendance and motivation. Only a few of the schools' officials said that they had experienced problems with vouchered students and these usually involved particular students--not WIN students as a group. Lack of prior counseling, attendance and personal problems were mentioned as the major problems. But despite the attendance problems in individual cases, a majority of the respondents said that attendance rates for manpower students, including WIN students, were equal to or better than those for vocational students in general.

Just under one third of the vouchered WIN students had left training before completion by the time of the school survey. Of these, only a small group had been expelled by the schools and the expulsion rate was on a par with that for all vocational students. The remainder, who had left training of their own volition, usually did so because of personal problems, according to the respondents from private schools; public school officials frequently did not know the reasons for voluntary withdrawals.

The Schools' Reactions To Vouchering

Overall, vouchering did not seem to make a great deal of difference to the schools. Only insofar as vouchering reduced pretraining counseling

and screening of vocational trainees did it contribute to negative attitudes toward the program.[3]

Only one-third of the respondents said that their schools had experienced some sort of administrative or business problems. But in only two cases were such problems directly related to features of the vouchering system. The remaining problems--billing schedules, slow payment, and so on--appear to have been directed more at WIN than at vouchering itself. For two thirds of the schools, neither advantages nor disadvantages were noted. There was only one explicit statement to the effect that the vouchering system was easier to administer than the conventional system.

Public schools found the one-year limit on training restrictive; a corrective measure suggested by some of these respondents was to provide for extensions in individual cases. Private schools, on the other hand, generally did not find the time limit to be restrictive, though some also thought that provisions should be made for extensions, or that limits on length of training should be related to the training occupations. In general, the $2,500 cost ceiling was not seen as restrictive. But here, too, some suggested adjusting cost limits to the training occupations.

In their reactions to a description of the vouchering idea, substantial proportions of both public and private school respondents indicated agreement to the vouchering rationale, although some qualified their agreement by citing a need for more counseling and screening of trainees prior to enrollment. Some of the officials, however, disagreed with the concept largely on the same lack of counseling grounds.

---

[3]Client-centered, vocational counseling was made available as part of the voucher program, but participation was voluntary. We shall be able to assess the rate of use of this counseling when analysis of data from participants' questionnaires is completed.

In a final attitudinal battery, the respondents indicated rather limited confidence in WIN participants' ability to make viable decisions about occupations and training. Public school respondents were a bit more likely to lack confidence in the WIN registrants, but they were more sanguine than those from private schools about the WIN clients' ability to withstand the blandishments of commerical schools once they had made a training decision.

The relatively low confidence in WIN students' ability to make good occupational choices, as indicated in these attitudinal data, seem to contradict the high marks which the schools gave their vouchered WIN students on the appropriateness of their occupational choices. We suggest that this may reflect a stereotyping phenomenon. Viewed impersonally as a group, WIN registrants are assumed to have limited resources in making occupational decisions. At the individual level, however, the WIN registrant becomes a student like most other students and is evaluated in this context.

Finally, we note that for both public and private schools, there were few indications of stigmatization of WIN participants among students.

Conclusions

Our conclusions are, of course, based on the data which representatives of the various schools gave us and on the impressions we formed while talking with these respondents. We now have a much better feel for how the schools involved in the vouchering progr[illegible] interpret their own operations and how they look at the vocational training situation.

Beyond that, we know that the voucher system, per se, posed no particular problems for the schools. We think that this specific finding can be generalized to a larger population of schools with sufficient confidence that vouchering of institutional training can be applied on a wider scale without undue concern on that point.

Moreover, the schools so far do not seem to have behaved unethically or in an over-eager manner with respect to vouchering; the private schools, about which concern is most often expressed, apparently did not tailor courses especially for the program, they professed reasonable insistence on attendance and performance standards, and there were efforts aimed at preventing students from pursuing inappropriate training objectives. At the same time, one cannot conclude from this that problems will not arise if vouchers do become available on a larger scale and over a longer period of time.

Two themes, developed from the interviews, suggest that established private schools are particularly dependent upon and sensitive to public opinion concerning their operations and are reluctant to jeopardize their reputations in the community. From the interviews we learned that private schools, to a greater extent than public schools, are largely dependent on word-of-mouth "advertising" or their reputation among former and potential students as a means of recruiting new students. Respondents in private schools also indicated their need for protecting their reputations among employers for turning out employable graduates. It appears that the established private schools, to a greater degree than the public schools, are restrained from overly zealous recruiting or exaggerated claims for performance out of a need to retain a high regard among both potential students and prospective employers of their graduates.

It may be that the vouchered students' views of the schools and of the training they received will be somewhat different than the story we got from the schools. And any attempt at evaluating the effectiveness of training, whether on the dimension of vouchering/nonvouchering or on the dimension of type of school, will have to await analysis of post-training labor force experience. At this point, we have established from the schools' standpoint and here described a number of relevant aspects of vouchered vocational training. Contrary to our expectations, we have also come away with an impression that is favorable to the private schools. We believe at this point that replications of the vouchering program on a wider scale should not be inhibited by concerns about the motives and methods of most private schools.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . . iii

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY . . . . . v

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION . . . . . 1

II. THE SCHOOLS. . . . . 7

III. THE SCHOOLS LOOK AT THEIR OWN OPERATION. . . . . 16

IV. MATCHING STUDENTS WITH TRAINING OCCUPATIONS. . . . . 41

V. THE SCHOOLS LOOK AT THEIR STUDENTS . . . . . 52

VI. THE SCHOOLS LOOK AT VOUCHERING . . . . . 61

VII. SUMMARY AND GENERAL CONCLUSIONS. . . . . 76

APPENDIX A. . . . . 81

APPENDIX B. . . . . 86

APPENDIX C. . . . . 105

LIST OF TABLES


| Table | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Manpower Program Involvement of Proprietary Schools . . . | 14 |
| 2 | Proportions of Schools Mentioning Various Recruitment Methods by Proprietary Status of Schools. . . . . | 18 |
| 3 | Ranking On Proportion of Manpower-Program Students Among All Students of 5 Schools Mentioning Government Referrals As a Recruitment Method . . . . . | 20 |
| 4 | Proportions of Private Schools Mentioning Various Indirect Recruitment Methods by Size of Schools . . . . | 21 |
| 5A | Proportions of Schools Using Various Admissions Procedures By Proprietary Status of Schools . . . . . | 24 |
| 5B | Proportions of Schools Using Additional Admissions Procedures for Some Applicants by Proprietary Status of Schools. . . . . | 25 |
| 6A | Provision of Counseling Prior To Training by Proprietary Status of Schools . . . . . | 27 |
| 6B | Proportions of Schools Mentioning Various Types of Pretraining Counseling by Proprietary Status of Schools . . . . . | 28 |
| 7A | Provision of Counseling During Training by Proprietary Status of Schools . . . . . | 29 |
| 7B | Proportions of Schools Mentioning Various Types of In-Training Counseling by Proprietary Status of Schools . . . . . | 30 |
| 8A | Proportions of Schools Providing Placement Services by Proprietary Status of Schools . . . . . | 31 |
| 8B | Proportions of Schools Mentioning Various Types of Placement Services by Proprietary Status of Schools . . | 32 |
| 9 | Schools' Estimates of Placement Rates by Proprietary Status of Schools . . . . . | 35 |
| 10 | Proportions of Schools Mentioning Advantages and Disadvantages of Public and Private Schools by Proprietary Status of Schools . . . . . | 37 |

LIST OF TABLES--Continued


| Table | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 11 | Proportions of Schools Using Tests During Admission Process by Proprietary Status of Schools. . . . . | 43 |
| 12 | Appropriateness of Vouchered WIN Students' Occupational Choices As Appraised by Schools . . . . . | 45 |
| 13A | Reasons for and Timing of Changes In Program of Vouchered WIN Students In Private Schools . . . . . | 47 |
| 13B | Occupations Involved In Changes of Programs of Vouchered WIN Students. . . . . | 47 |
| 14 | Vocational Programs of Vouchered WIN Students by Proprietary Status of Schools . . . . . | 53 |
| 15 | Proportions of Students Whom Schools Felt Could Better Obtain Vocational Training Elsewhere. . . . . | 54 |
| 16 | Proportions of Vouchered WIN Students for Whom Data Were Available Who Were Evaluated Average or Above Average On Selected Criteria of Performance . . . . . | 55 |
| 17 | Schools' Comparisons of Estimated Dropout Rates of All Vocational Students, Manpower Program Students and Vouchered WIN Students. . . . . | 58 |
| 18 | Reasons Vouchered Students Dropped Out of Training On Own Initiative According to Schools' Information by Proprietary Status of Schools . . . . . | 59 |
| 19 | Proportions of Schools Stating That Billing and Related Problems Were Encountered During the Vouchering Demonstration . . . . . | 62 |
| 20 | Proportions of Schools Recording Various Reactions to Limits Imposed On the Portland Vouchering Demonstration . . . . . | 65 |
| 21 | Proportions of Schools Reacting In Various Ways to the Vouchering Concept and the Idea of Allowing WIN Registrants to Choose Own School and Occupation . . . . | 70 |
| 22 | Summary of School Representatives' Responses to Statements About Vouchering. . . . . | 71 |
| A1 | Positions of Respondents to School Survey . . . . . | 82 |
| A2 | Analysis of Missing Part B Data On Individual, Vouchered WIN Students. . . . . | 83 |

## LIST OF FIGURES


| Figure | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Occupational Areas, Size and Proprietary Status of Schools Attended by Vouchered WIN Students. . . . . | vii |
| 2 | Occupational Areas, Size and Proprietary Status of Schools Attended by Vouchered WIN Students. . . . . | 10 |
| 3 | Tests Mentioned by Various Schools As Used During Admission Process . . . . . | 44 |
| 4 | Changes In Length and Content of Programs for Vouchered WIN Trainees. . . . . | 48 |
| 5 | Types of Billing and Related Problems Encountered by Schools . . . . . | 64 |

## CHAPTER I

## Introduction

### Background

This is a report on a survey of the schools which provided training to Work Incentive Program (WIN) registrants in an exploratory program to test the feasibility of introducing a voucher system for the purchase of occupational skill training by such persons.

Essentially, vouchering is a mechanism for modifying the relationships between public agencies and their clients by replacing the provision of goods or services in kind with a certificate or some other form of authorization which will permit the client to select and "purchase" what is needed from some range of goods or services as well as from a more or less specified range of vendors.

Two sets of hypotheses underlie widespread interest in the vouchering of publicly provided services. The first set concerns the demand side of agency-client relationship and suggests that:

1. vouchering will broaden the range of services and vendors available to the client;

2. allowing the client to choose from among the broadened range of services and vendors will increase the chances of meeting needs adequately since the client best knows his or her needs, interests and abilities;

3. allowing the client to make his or her own decisions will enhance self-esteem, feelings of personal efficiacy, and committment to the accomplishment of goals, as well as provide experience in dealing with a variety of institutions.

The second set of hypotheses concerns the supply side. Here, it is suggested that free-market processes will operate to increase vendors' responsiveness to client needs as a number of vendors compete for the client's patronage. Moreover, these same competitive processes should, hypothetically, force undesirable vendors out of the market as clients withhold patronage, and provide opportunities for new, innovative vendors to enter the market. In addition to these hypotheses, administrative savings are expected to accrue from vouchering as clients assume responsibility for actions previously carried out on their behalf by the administrative staffs of the public agencies and the vendors.

Although not always identified as such, vouchering programs have been used for the provision of social services in the United States for a number of years. The provision of education benefits under the G.I. Bill is mentioned frequently as a prototype of vouchering by a public agency. The Food Stamp program, Medicare and Medicaid, and the Judicare program all represent variants of vouchering. More recently interest has grown in the application of vouchering to elementary and secondary education, housing, the purchase of jobs, and manpower training.

A number of trials of vouchering in the manpower training and employment fields have been conducted in the past several years. For example, income maintenance experiments in Seattle and Denver include vouchered manpower training components; vouchers were used on a limited scale in a public employment program for veterans in Orange County, California; smaller-scale employment and training programs have been established in Massachusetts.

With the application of vouchering to manpower training under serious consideration by the Manpower Administration, Leonard Goodwin

(then at The Brookings Institution) outlined a design for an experiment to test vouchering as a means of delivery of manpower training for WIN program participants. Characteristically, however, vouchering designs not only deviate from a pure, unrestricted model as designers incorporate modifications intended to achieve certain desirable consequences or prevent undesirable ones. When actually implemented, they encounter additional constraints imposed by the real-world situations in which they must operate. This would be particularly true of the introduction of vouchering to an already functioning program such as WIN. Questions were raised not only with respect to the direct effects of vouchering itself, but as to the possibilities of fitting the requirements of a vouchering experiment into the existing structure and regulatory features of WIN. Accordingly, a decision was made to undertake a somewhat limited test of the administrative feasibility of the system before attempting a full-scale experiment or demonstration.

In early 1974, the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., under a grant from the Manpower Administration, designed an exploratory program to test the feasibility of vouchering institutional vocational training in WIN. Portland, Oregon, was selected as a site for the exploratory study. The project design called for issuance of vouchers for institutional vocational training to 200 WIN participants who were eligible for and desired such training. Although the achievement of research objectives would be enhanced by minimum restrictions on the use of vouchers, practical considerations required the establishment of some limits:

1. Time.--Vouchers could be used to pay for up to one year of skill training which would lead to a "reasonable expectation" of employability.

2. Cost.--While no absolute limit was set on the cost of training, any training proposal which would incur costs in excess of $2,500 would require approval by the Regional Assistant Director for Manpower.

3. Occupations.--Vouchers could be used to purchase training for any occupation. Training which involved strictly avocational content was not voucherable. Moreover, the one year time limit (and, unintentionally, the timing of the demonstration) did have the effect of excluding training for some occupations.

4. Geographic Location.--Vouchered training had to be conducted within the Oregon portion of the Portland Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area.

Beginning in April, 1974, the Portland WIN office of the Oregon Employment Division began issuing vouchers to WIN clients who chose to obtain institutional skill training as a part of their participation in the WIN program. By the fall of 1974, when BSSR established a cutoff date for collection of data, 167 clients had used vouchers to purchase skill training in 28 schools in the Portland area.[1]

The School Survey

In March, 1975, as a part of a continuing effort to evaluate the institutional vouchering program, the Bureau staff undertook a survey of 27 schools which had enrolled vouchered trainees.[2] This survey

---

[1]A more complete discussion of the demonstration's background as well as some initial findings regarding clients' participation are reported in Ann Richardson and Laure M. Sharp, The Feasibility of Vouchered Training in WIN: Report on the First Phase of a Study, Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., December, 1974.

[2]We were able to interview only 27 schools because one had gone out of business in the interim.

of schools was aimed at determining, from the schools' viewpoint, whether or not vouchering is feasible, as well as obtaining information on:

--training vendors' reactions to the voucher program,

--factors in their decision to accept WIN clients as students,

--their involvement in planning the training course for the individual (including any attempts to tailor training to accomodate the one-year training limit designed for the program), and

--their estimates of the appropriateness of the clients' choices of occupations and schools.

The school survey and this report of its results, then, were intended to provide a view of the vouchering demonstration from the supplier side.

During the survey, appropriate officials in each of the schools were interviewed by the authors of this report. A two-part interview schedule was used during interviews which lasted from 30 minutes to about 2 hours, depending largely on the number of vouchered WIN students who had been enrolled. The first part of the interview schedule covered information concerning the school and its operations as well as general information regarding vouchering and vouchered students taken in aggregate. The second part sought information concerning the individual WIN students who had enrolled. Although the use of a questionnaire for data collection and the design of the data collection process limit the scope of the data in several ways,[3] we feel that we obtained a reasonably clear idea of how the schools operated with and experienced the vouchered training program. Our purpose in the following pages will be to describe what our respondents told us about their schools, the experience they had with vouchering and vouchered WIN students, and the impressions we formed about the schools.

---

[3]See Appendix A for details.

Although the data base for some of these percentage distributions is rather small, we are following the practice of presenting percentages, rather than absolute numbers, for the convenience of readers. In all tables, we have followed the convention of rounding to the even percentage--total percentages greater or less than 100 result from this rounding in some cases.

A copy of each part of the interview schedule appears in Appendix B.

CHAPTER II

## The Schools

### General Characteristics

The program participants purchased training with their vouchers in both public and private schools. The schools ranged from small, owner-operated institutions in which the owner was the only staff person to a large university with over 800 persons on the instructional staff. There were schools which specialized in a single occupation, schools which trained students for a number of occupations within a specific occupational area, and schools which provided programs in a wide variety of occupations and occupational areas.[1] The public/private distinction proved to be crucial, reflecting both size and occupational specialization as well as a number of more subjective differences.

All of the public schools were large and all provided multiple occupational programs. We classified one of these schools as academic

---

[1] In a number of our analyses, we will classify the schools by size, proprietary status and occupational area. The categories are as follows:

Size: Large--51 or more instructors
Medium--6-50 instructors
Small--1-5 instructors

Proprietary Status: Public
Proprietary (or private)

Occupational Area: Academic
Multiple Occupations
Business/Commercial Occupations
Medical and Dental Allied Occupations
Personal Service Occupations
Industrial/Transportation Occupations

and the remaining four as multiple occupation schools. Four of these large, public schools were community colleges which offered a number of distinct, explicitly vocational programs (e.g., programs which led to certification as an automotive mechanic, medical assistant, or clerk-typist).[2] Characteristically, while these schools saw such programs as vocationally oriented and aimed at enhancing employability, supporting courses were offered and the schools saw the opportunity for the vocational student to broaden his or her educational background as an important supplement to occupational skill training. The fifth public school was a four-year university that did not identify any of its programs--or students--as "vocational." Both respondents at this school reflected the academic orientation of the school in viewing all students as potential degree candidates. Thus, all of the public schools were large, four of them offered multiple occupational programs with some emphasis on general educational improvement while the fifth was clearly academic in orientation. Together, these five schools had enrolled 42 percent of the vouchered WIN registrants.

None of the proprietary schools was large; 11 were medium-sized and 11 were small. For the most part, these schools were much more specialized--only one, a correspondence school with one resident program --was a multiple occupation school. The other private schools either provided training for a number of specific occupations within a general occupational cluster, or specialized in training people for a single occupation. For example, a school in the former category was a business

---

[2]There were actually three community colleges plus branch community centers of two of these. One community college provided information for its main campus and its branch through a single source; we have treated this college and its branch as one school. A second college and its branch were interviewed separately and have been treated as separate schools.

and secretarial school which had distinct programs leading to certification as data processors, programmers, keypunchers, accountants, bookkeepers, secretaries (including general, legal, medical, etc.), clerk-typists, and receptionists. An example of the highly specialized category was a small, owner-operated school which trained dog groomers in conjunction with providing services to customers. Characteristically, the proprietary schools emphasized qualification of students for employment as their major objective. Such schools placed emphasis on the provision of basic occupational skills and tended to downplay the value or necessity of improving the general educational background of the student. These proprietary schools accounted for 58 percent of the vouchered WIN students.

All of the schools except 3 stated that they were approved for VA training by the appropriate state agency. The exceptions were a medium-sized, largely correspondence school which had approval for only one of its programs and 2 schools, one medium and one small, in the personal service occupational area.

The occupational foci, size and proprietary statuses of the schools which trained vouchered WIN clients are summarized in Figure 2.

Enrollments

As might be expected, the public and private schools are simply not in the same class insofar as sizes of enrollments are concerned. At the same time, there are differences between public and private schools in the extent to which students sponsored by manpower training programs, including the WIN vouchering program, were represented.

Three of the public schools reported total annual enrollments between 12,000 and 17,000. The last of these reported that 7,400 of

ACADEMIC

Large

FOUR-YEAR UNIVERSITY - 1

MULTIPLE OCCUPATIONS

Large

COMMUNITY COLLEGES - 3

COMMUNITY COLLEGE BRANCH - 1

Medium

Correspondence School - 1

BUSINESS/COMMERCIAL OCCUPATIONS

Medium

Business and Secretarial Schools - 3

Business and Radio/TV Broadcasting School - 1

Commercial Art School - 1

Floral Design School - 1

Small

Business and Secretarial School - 1

Secretarial School - 1

Real Estate Schools - 2

MEDICAL AND DENTAL ALLIED OCCUPATIONS

Medium

Medical and Dental Allied School - 1

Small

Medical and Dental Allied School - 1

PERSONAL SERVICE OCCUPATIONS

Medium

Child Day Care Aide School - 1

Small

Beauty School - 3

Barbering School - 1

Dog Grooming School - 1

INDUSTRIAL/TRANSPORTATION OCCUPATIONS

Medium

Truck Driving School - 1

Metal Trade, Machinery Repair and Electronics School - 1

Small

Upholstering School - 1

Note: PUBLIC SCHOOLS SHOWN IN CAPITALS; Private Schools in Initial Capitals.

FIGURE 2

OCCUPATIONAL AREAS, SIZE AND PROPRIETARY STATUS OF SCHOOLS ATTENDED BY VOUCHERED MIN STUDENTS

ts students were full- or part-time vocational students. The academic university had an overall enrollment of about 9,000 but did not recognize the vocational distinction. The fifth public school--the branch community college--could not provide an overall enrollment figure because its programs include a number of noncredit, community-oriented courses, but reported that 1,500 of its students were vocational students.

It is clear that manpower programs, including the WIN vouchering program, do not loom large as sources of students for these public schools. The school reporting the largest contingent of manpower program students said that 1,500 such students were enrolled.[3] These comprised 10 percent of the student body, but the WIN voucher component comprised less than 0.2 percent of the student body. The second large school for which we have the requisite data had a manpower contingent comprising 3 percent of the student body while the WIN contingent accounted for less than 0.1 percent. A third school reported that 0.9 percent of its

---

[3] In addition to WIN, local projects funded under the federal Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA), the U.S. Veterans Administration (VA), and the Oregon Department of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR) all subsidize institutional vocational training of selected clients. For this study, the data on numbers of students from manpower programs reported by both public and private schools include those from CETA, WIN and DVR, but not those in VA funded programs.

While we do not have breakdowns of the numbers of students by sponsoring program, our impression is that DVR students comprised the largest proportions of manpower program students at the several community colleges. In part, this is because of an active outreach program conducted by DVR.

It should be noted that the design of CETA, as well as the impending addition to WIN of a Job Search activity and an Intensive Manpower Services Component, reflects a continuing deemphasis of institutional training activities in favor of on-the-job training and other job placement activities. Presumably, the shift toward emphasis on placement resulted from disenchantment with the outcomes of vocational training programs in terms of long-range employment effects.

students were from manpower programs. It was this third school that had the largest group of WIN voucher students (n = 38) among the 27 schools, but they comprised only 0.2 percent of the total student body.

Except for business office representatives who had dealt directly with sponsoring agencies, our respondents tended not to think in such terms as "manpower students" or "WIN trainees." We attribute this to the relatively small proportions which such students comprise in most of the schools as well as to the fact that current manpower programs emphasize individual referrals to training institutions in place of the earlier emphasis on group referrals. For most of our respondents at the large schools, students were students and questions regarding special programs required additional record searches. In short, WIN students as well as those from other manpower programs (with the possible exception of DVR students with visible physical handicaps) do not stand out in these large schools, partly because their numbers are relatively small and partly, we think, because their backgrounds may not differ drastically from those of many other students.

Annual enrollments of the private schools were much smaller than those of the public schools, ranging from 24 at each of 2 schools to 1,000 at each of 2 schools. It must be noted, though, that these are estimated annual enrollments. Because of shorter, more intensive programs and overlapping cycles in many cases, the number of students actually enrolled in a school at any given time may be much lower than the annual enrollment figure. By and large, the private schools perceive all enrollees as students whose task is skill or credentials acquisition for the purpose of immediate post-training employment. Although the schools recognize that some students may enroll for reasons other than

employability enhancement and some may not seek employment immediately after training, these exceptions are seen as rare and do not count heavily in the schools' perceptions of their students. In this sense, private schools see all their students as "vocational" students.

In sum (Table 1), the private schools tended to be much more heavily involved with students sponsored by manpower programs than did the public schools. Exactly half of the private schools drew on manpower programs for 20 percent or more of their students and some of them quite clearly would have hard going without that source of students.

Vouchered WIN students, in most cases, comprised larger proportions of the overall enrollments of the private schools than was the case with public schools, but the proportions still were not very large. In public institutions, WIN students comprised less than one half of 1 percent in each school whereas WIN enrollments in the private schools ranged up to 11 percent.

While some of these private schools clearly are rather heavily dependent on governmentally subsidized students, there is little evidence that the WIN vouchering program proved a windfall for any of them.[4] In only 6 schools did WIN voucher students account for half or more of the students enrolled from manpower programs, and 5 of these schools had

---

[4]Of course, there was little opportunity for schools to exploit the shift to a system which placed school decisions in the hands of students. Vouchering only lasted for a few months and the change to vouchering was not publicized. In fact, while a number of respondents at the private schools were aware that some change in administrative procedures had taken place, few seemed to be aware of the nature and rationale of the programmatic changes in WIN vocational training.

We also looked at the concentrations of WIN students in relation to the sizes and occupational specialization areas of private schools. In neither case did we find that any particular category of schools had inordinately high or low concentrations of such students.

TABLE I

MANPOWER PROGRAM INVOLVEMENT OF PROPRIETARY SCHOOLS

| | Manpower Program Enrollment | | WIN Voucher Enrollment | | | Estimated Total Enrollment, Past Year |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Percent of Total Enrollment | Number | Percent of Total Enrollment | Percent of Manpower Enrollment | Number | |
| | 71 | (25) | 11 | 16 | (4) | (35) |
| | 60 | (30) | 8 | 13 | (4) | (50) |
| | 48 | (240) | 1 | 3 | (7) | (500) |
| | 45 | (36) | 3 | 6 | (2) | (80) |
| | 34 | (47) | 1 | 2 | (1) | (140) |
| | 33 | (333) | 1 | 3 | (9) | (1000) |
| | 33 | (100) | 2 | 6 | (6) | (300) |
| | 24 | (240) | 1 | 3 | (7) | (1000) |
| | 23 | (8) | 6 | 25 | (2) | (35) |
| | 21 | (5) | 8 | 40 | (2) | (24) |
| | 20 | (38) | 5 | 26 | (10) | (194) |
| | 17 | (14) | 4 | 21 | (3) | (81) |
| | 14 | (50) | 8 | 54 | (27) | (350) |
| | 9 | (4) | 2 | 25 | (1) | (45) |
| | 6 | (2) | 3 | 50 | (1) | (34) |
| | 5 | (6) | 1 | 17 | (1) | (114) |
| | 5 | (5) | 3 | 60 | (3) | (100) |
| | 4 | (1) | 4 | 100 | (1) | (24) |
| | 4 | (5) | 4 | 100 | (5) | (120) |
| | 2 | (10) | * | 10 | (1) | (500) |
| | 2 | (10) | * | 10 | (1) | (575) |
| | * | (1) | * | 100 | (1) | (1000) |
| Median | 20 | | 4 | 20 | | |

* Less Than 0.5 percent

manpower enrollments of 5 or fewer students. Moreover, at these 5 schools, the proportion of manpower students to all students was small (6 percent or less). One school, a medium-sized, business/commercial school, did have an appreciably large number of manpower students enrolled (50 students, or 14% of the overall enrollment) of whom 54 percent were from WIN. In absolute numbers, the WIN contingent at this school (N = 27) was exceeded in size only by the large group at one of the public schools.[5]

[5]There could be many valid reasons for the concentration of WIN students at this school. Our interview data suggest that this school was quite impressive on a number of counts.

## CHAPTER III

### The Schools Look At Their Own Operations

Private schools in the vocational training field have frequently been accused of improper recruiting--of using a "hard sell" to lure students into training that is inadequate or inappropriate. Indeed, the image of private schools--or at least some of them--as motivated only by profit, combined with assumptions about the vulnerability of WIN registrants to pressure tactics, caused considerable concern when vouchering of WIN institutional training was under consideration. Therefore, we were interested in how the schools actually go about recruiting their students as well as what sorts of efforts they make in assisting their students during training as well as efforts they make to place their students in jobs after training.

These were sensitive topics, particularly for the private schools. Such schools are quite aware of the unsavory practices often imputed to them and of the regulatory measures being proposed. As we will note from time to time, the sensitivity of these topics may have colored the responses in some cases. But private schools were sometimes more critical of their own kind than were representatives of the public schools.

#### Student Recruitment

The schools use a variety of methods to attract students. Some of these methods emphasize direct contact with the general public as well as with potential students; others tend to be more indirect--media advertising, mail and information passed by word-of-mouth. By and large,

the public schools seem to be more prone to use methods which involve personal contact with potential students by school representatives while the private schools more often use the indirect methods.

For example, three of the public schools mentioned visits to high schools by school representatives and two mentioned visits to service or community organizations; a like number mentioned using open houses and information booths (Table 2).[1] Private schools, on the other hand, mentioned direct, personal contact as a means of recruitment in considerably smaller proportions. Only one quarter of the private schools mentioned visits to high schools and fewer than 1 in 10 mentioned each of the other forms of direct contact. Two of the private schools, however, reported using salesmen or field representatives to contact potential students directly.[2]

Public schools did use indirect methods in addition to making person-to-person contacts; 3 of the 5 advertised in the newspapers, 2 used radio and TV commercials, and 1 mailed a tabloid-sized announcement of available courses to some 65,000 post office boxholders in the community. In fact, this last school considered the mailout to be its

---

[1]Our question about recruiting was open-ended: "How about your recruitment procedures? How do you go about attracting vocational education students?" We recorded the responses given and coded them later. It is possible, therefore, that some schools use methods which did not come to mind during the interviews. We assume that those which they did mention were the most frequently used or the most important methods.

[2]The question about recruitment methods was one which raised a caution flag for private schools. For example, one respondent who described frequent visits to high schools hastily added that the name of the sponsoring private school was "seldom if ever mentioned." The respondent's talks to high school students were "only to tell them about the various occupations." As a result of sensitivity to charges of high-handed advertising and recruiting, our private schools may have tended to underplay their use of direct-contact methods.

TABLE 2

PROPORTIONS OF SCHOOLS MENTIONING VARIOUS RECRUITMENT METHODS
BY PROPRIETARY STATUS OF SCHOOLS
(In Percentages)

| Recruitment Methods | Proprietary Status | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Public (N = 5) | Private (N = 22) | All (N = 27) |
| **Personal Contact By School Representatives** | | | |
| Visits to high schools | 60 | 27 | 33 |
| Visits to service and community organizations | 40 | 5 | 11 |
| Open houses and info. booths | 40 | 9 | 15 |
| Contacts by salesmen and field representatives | - | 9 | 7 |
| **Impersonal/Indirect Methods** | | | |
| Yellow Page Advertisements | - | 73 | 59 |
| Newspaper Advertisements | 60 | 64 | 63 |
| Word-of-Mouth Advertising | - | 59 | 48 |
| Radio & TV | 40 | 27 | 30 |
| Mail-Outs to H. S. Teachers | - | 23 | 19 |
| Government Agency Referrals | - | 23 | 19 |
| Mail-Outs to Potential Students | 20 | 18 | 19 |
| Magazine Advertisements | - | 9 | 7 |
| Others | 20[a] | 9[b] | 11 |

[a]Contacts with veterans at a branch of the college.

[b]Referrals from a chain of beauty salons; referrals from employment brokers.

primary recruiting tool. But private schools relied quite heavily on noncontact methods of attracting students. Three-quarters of them advertised in the yellow pages of the telephone book, almost 2 out of 3 used newspaper ads, use of radio and TV commercials and mailouts to high school teachers were mentioned by a fourth, and 1 in 5 mailed information directly to potential students. Only 2 private schools, one of which was a school devoted largely to correspondence courses and presumably seeking a wider audience, mentioned using magazine advertisements.

Word-of-mouth advertising deserves special notice not only because it was mentioned by over half of the private schools, but also because it was considered particularly important by many of the respondents who did mention it. This was especially true of the small schools, 73 percent of whom reported reliance on informal networks to get the word out about their schools.

Also deserving of separate mention are the 5 private schools who cited government agency referrals as a means of getting students. Three of them were, in fact, the highest of any of the 27 schools in the proportion of manpower students among their overall enrollment (Table 3). These 3 schools appear to be quite content with relying primarily on referrals, using only yellow-page advertisement and word-of-mouth or mailouts (1 case) as supplementary methods.

Most of the indirect methods relied on by the private schools, involve services which must be purchased--radio and TV time, advertising space in the printed media, or printing and mailing. Word-of-mouth advertising and referrals are the two exceptions to the requirement for expenditures of funds for advertising. It is not surprising, therefore, that size makes a difference in the types of recruiting methods most

TABLE 3

RANKING ON PROPORTION OF MANPOWER PROGRAM STUDENTS AMONG ALL STUDENTS OF 5 SCHOOLS MENTIONING GOVERNMENT REFERRALS AS A RECRUITMENT METHOD

| School Description | Rank Order On Proportion Of Manpower Students | Manpower Students As Percentage Of Total Enrollment |
|---|---|---|
| A Private, Small, Personal Service School | 1 | 71 |
| A Private, Small, Industrial/ Transportation School | 2 | 60 |
| A Private, Medium, Business/ Commercial School | 3 | 48 |
| A Private, Medium, Business/ Commercial School | 8 | 24 |
| A Private, Small, Medical and Dental Allied School | 11 | 20 |

often favored by the private schools--presumably, the medium-sized schools can better afford outlays for advertising than can the small schools. The medium-sized private schools do tend to select relatively costly forms of advertising more frequently than do the smaller schools (Table 4). The resources which small schools can allot to their efforts to recruit students may be very limited. For example, one very small, owner-operated school we talked to could afford only an ad in the yellow pages and an occasional ad in a small community newspaper--the owner saw the school's reputation spread via the grapevine as the most important factor in attracting students.

Only one third of the schools said that staff personnel were assigned specifically to student recruitment duties. Such assignments were made by 60 percent of the public schools and 27 percent of the private schools. Visiting high schools was the most frequently mentioned

TABLE 4

PROPORTIONS OF PRIVATE SCHOOLS MENTIONING VARIOUS INDIRECT RECRUITMENT METHODS BY SIZE OF SCHOOLS (IN PERCENTAGES)

| Recruitment Methods | Size of School | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Small (N = 11) | Medium (N = 11) | Both (N = 22) |
| Radio and TV | 18 | 36 | 27 |
| Magazine Advertisements | - | 18 | 9 |
| Newspaper Advertisements | 55 | 73 | 64 |
| Yellow Page Advertisements | 55 | 91 | 73 |
| Mail-outs To Potential Students | 27 | 9 | 18 |
| Mail-outs To High School Teachers | 18 | 27 | 23 |
| Government Agency Referrals | 27 | 18 | 23 |
| Referrals By Employers/Brokers | 18 | - | 9 |
| Word-Of-Mouth | 73 | 45 | 59 |

activity of recruiting personnel (44% of the schools which had such personnel), follow-up of responses to mailouts was the next most frequently mentioned activity (33%); actively selling training and merely coordinating recruiting activities were each mentioned by 1 school.

The data we obtained do not give us any insights into the ways in which the schools present themselves and the opportunities they purport to offer. They do, however, suggest that many of the schools are limited in the efforts which they can put into recruiting students.

We think it likely that accessibility is a major reason for the heavier use of personal contact methods by public than by private schools.

We would expect that by virtue of their public status and legitimacy as educational institutions, the public schools would be admitted more readily to high schools and community organizations. Private schools, on the other hand, must overcome the image of being commercial, profit-making enterprises. We do not know how the radio and TV time mentioned by the schools breaks down into purchased and nonpurchased time.[3] Some of the public schools may have been referring to public service announcements as well as news and sports coverage. By and large, we suspect, private schools must purchase radio and TV time.

Later analyses based on data obtained from the vouchered WIN registrants themselves should illuminate the specific recruitment methods to which they were exposed as well as their reactions.

Admission Procedures

In Chapter II, we pointed to some fundamental differences in the orientations of the public and private schools. These differences appear to have crucial effects on the extent and ways in which the schools screen persons seeking admission.[4] In line with their mandate to provide a wide range of educational opportunities to all members of the community, the community colleges, which comprise 4 out of our 5 public schools, pursue open enrollment policies. Most of the private schools, on the other hand, at least express concern that their applicants be sufficiently qualified in terms of personal characteristics and background to give reasonable assurance of ultimate qualification for employment.

---

[3]Forty percent of the public schools and 27 percent of the private schools mentioned radio and TV as means of attracting students.

[4]In this section, we will limit ourselves generally to describing the admissions procedures of the schools. Because of the importance of the question, we will reserve for the following chapter our discussion of selectivity in terms of employability objectives.

Criteria for admission described as "normal for all students" were almost nonexistent in the public schools (Table 5A). Only in the case of the academic university was there an implication that students had to meet certain standards to gain admission. The community colleges were quite explicit in stating that anyone who wanted to enroll could do so, subject to residence requirements and ability to pay the tuition. But in a number of cases, these public schools did rely on additional procedures for admission to particular courses and programs (Table 5B). Additionally, some of these schools indicated that testing was available at the request of students or when a school counselor recommended it.

The application of admission criteria is not solely governed by the requirements of programs or the characteristics of individuals nor are institutional policies necessarily consistent. Overcrowding in some programs can become the reason for abrogating an open enrollment policy. For example, one community college required, on substantive grounds, that an applicant for the Legal Assistant Program have 2 years' experience as a legal secretary. Criteria for entry into the Allied Health Sciences program in the same college, however, had been upgraded because of limited space and the Forestry department had initiated testing for the same reason. Yet the Fisheries department which also was overcrowded had resorted to a first-come, first-served basis for admission. Other programs remained on an open enrollment basis although our respondent suggested that further changes might come as the college reached full capacity.

The private schools tended to specify a much wider range of admission procedures as normal for all applicants. Most of these schools said they interviewed all applicants, roughly three quarters determined

TABLE 5A

PROPORTIONS OF SCHOOLS USING VARIOUS ADMISSIONS PROCEDURES[a]
BY PROPIETARY STATUS OF SCHOOLS
(In Percentages)

| Admissions Procedures | Proprietary Status | | All (N = 27) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Public (N = 5) | Private (N = 22) | |
| General Interview with Applicant | 20 | 86 | 74 |
| Determine Prior Schooling | 60 | 73 | 70 |
| Determine Prior Work Experience | - | 45 | 37 |
| Examine School Transcripts | 20 | 45 | 41 |
| References From Previous Employers, H. S. Counselors, or Character References | - | 23 | 19 |
| General Intelligence Tests | - | 5 | 4 |
| Educational Achievement Tests | - | 5 | 4 |
| Occupational Aptitude Tests | - | 27 | 22 |
| Other[b] | - | 32 | 26 |

[a] Includes admission procedures which the schools said were "normal for all students." See Table 8 for additional procedures used in some cases.

[b] Includes: Proof of age, blood test and TB Test (1 case). Personality Profile and Health Exam (1 case). Must be 18 years of age (1 case). Minimum 2 years of H. S. (1 case). High school graduate or GED (2 cases). "Admission Analysis" (survey of applicant's interests and hobbies to determine likelihood that applicant can complete program) (1 case). Informal aptitude determination during general interview (1 case).

TABLE 5B

PROPORTIONS OF SCHOOLS USING ADDITIONAL ADMISSIONS PROCEDURES FOR SOME APPLICANTS BY PROPRIETARY STATUS OF SCHOOLS
(In Percentages)

| Admissions Procedures | Proprietary Status | | All (N = 27) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Public (N = 5) | Private (N = 22) | |
| Intelligence Test for Certain Cases[a] | 20 | - | 4 |
| Education Achievement Tests for Certain Cases[a] | 40 | - | 7 |
| Occupational Aptitude Test for Certain Cases[a] | 60 | 5 | 15 |
| Additional Education/Aptitude Requirements for Nursing and Allied Health Applicants | 40 | - | 7 |
| Additional Education/Aptitude Requirement for Forestry Applicants | 20 | - | 4 |
| Legal Assistance Applicants Must Have 2 Years' Experience as Legal Secretary | 20 | - | 4 |
| Voice Test Required for Radio/TV Broadcasting Applicants | - | 9 | 7 |
| Aptitude Tests Required for Data Processing and Keypunch Applicants | - | 9 | 7 |
| Depth Perception Test Required for Welding Applicants | - | 5 | 4 |
| Mathematical Background Test Required for Electronics Applicants | - | 5 | 4 |
| Math/English Placement Test Required for General Educational Courses | 20 | - | 4 |
| Transcripts Required Only If Transfer of Credits Involved | 20 | - | 4 |
| Prior Work Experience Determined only if Equivalent Credit Involved | 20 | - | 4 |
| Prior Work Experience Determined Only for Older Applicants | - | 5 | 4 |

[a]Used infrequently, usually when requested by student or recommended by school's counselor.

applicants' prior schooling, almost half determined prior work experience and a like number examined school transcripts. Just under a quarter of the private schools required references and these were confined to small schools in the medical/dental-allied and personal service fields. In the latter case, the requirements frequently resulted from state regulations governing the licensing of barbers and beauty operators.

A few of the private schools reported admissions procedures applicable only in selected cases and these all involved some form of aptitude testing for particular occupations.

Of course, part of the private schools' propensity to require testing--particularly occupational aptitude testing--of all applicants more frequently than the public schools can be attributed to the higher degree of specialization of the private schools. But more of the private schools also interview applicants, determine prior schooling or work experience, and examine school transcripts than is the case with public schools. We have no data to determine whether or not the review of applicants' characteristics and background is translated into actual selectivity, or guidance into the most appropriate programs. It appears, however, that screening of applicants is more widespread and rigorous among private schools than among public schools.

Counseling

All of the public schools, and two-thirds of the private schools, said that they provided counseling to students prior to the beginning of training. But in the case of private schools, counseling was provided to all potential students, while the public schools usually said that pretraining counseling simply was available for those who wanted it (Table 6A). The actual content of this counseling varied from school

TABLE 6A

PROVISION OF COUNSELING PRIOR TO TRAINING
BY PROPRIETARY STATUS OF SCHOOLS
(In Percentages)

| Availability of Services | Proprietary Status | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Public | Private | All |
| Counseling Provided To All Students | -- | 68 | 56 |
| Counseling Available If Desired | 100 | -- | 19 |
| Counseling Not Offered | -- | 27 | 22 |
| Don't Know, No Answer | -- | 5 | 4 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 101 |
| (N) | (5) | (22) | (27) |

to school, but tended to center around finding out what sort of vocational training the applicant wanted and helping him to select a program from the school's offerings. In neither the public nor the private category did many schools offering pretraining counseling make an integrated effort to determine the client's occupational goals, advise on the appropriateness of those goals and then plan a program accordingly. For example, 2 of the public schools and a like proportion of the private schools said they determined the client's interests and occupational goals, but none of the public schools and only one quarter of the private schools attempted to advise the student on the appropriateness of the goals (Table 68). A considerably larger proportion of the public schools than of private schools said they assisted applicants in choosing and

TABLE 6B

PROPORTIONS OF SCHOOLS MENTIONING VARIOUS TYPES OF PRETRAINING COUNSELING BY PROPRIETARY STATUS OF SCHOOLS
(In Percentages)

| Types of Counseling Services | Proprietary Status | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Public (N = 5) | Private (N = 15) | All (N = 20) |
| Determine Client's Interests and/or Occupational Goals | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| Advise Client On Appropriateness Of Interests/Goals | - | 27 | 20 |
| Explain Availability Of Courses/ Programs | 20 | 13 | 15 |
| Explain Course/Program Content and What Is Expected | 20 | 27 | 25 |
| Assist Applicants In Choosing and Planning Program | 60 | 27 | 35 |
| Explain Employment Opportunities In Various Fields | 40 | 27 | 30 |
| Personal and/or Psychological Counseling | - | 27 | 20 |
| Other | - | 20 | 15 |

planning a program (60% vs. 40%), and somewhat more of the public schools explained employment opportunities to potential students (40 vs. 27%).

All but 2 of the schools, both private, said they offered counseling during training. Again, the counseling at public schools was largely on an as-desired basis while two thirds of the private schools said they counseled all students and one quarter said counseling was available as desired (Table 7A). Again, counseling in each category of schools was varied in content. Public schools tended somewhat more

PROVISION OF COUNSELING DURING TRAINING
BY PROPRIETARY STATUS OF SCHOOLS
(In Percentages)

| Availability of Services | Proprietary Status | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Public | Private | All |
| Counseling Provided To All Students | 20 | 68 | 59 |
| Counseling Available If Desired | 80 | 23 | 33 |
| Counseling Not Offered | -- | 5 | 4 |
| Don't Know, No Answer | -- | 5 | 4 |
| Total | 100 | 101 | 100 |
| (N) | (5) | (22) | (27) |

frequently to stress the planning of future training, while the private schools more often were concerned with appraisal of the students' progress and the handling of problems that came up during training (Table 78). While this does not show up clearly in the quantitative data, our conversations with respondents at the private schools suggest strongly that much of the personal counseling surrounds students' attendance problems. Moreover, the medical and dental-allied schools as well as several of the business/commercial schools indicated that counseling regarding personal appearance was considered quite important.

The data we have just described may give an unwarranted impression of rather formalized counseling at the private schools. While we did not ask specific questions on counseling personnel, the comments of our respondents indicated rather clearly that while all of the public schools

TABLE 7B

PROPORTIONS OF SCHOOLS MENTIONING VARIOUS TYPES OF IN-TRAINING COUNSELING BY PROPRIETARY STATUS OF SCHOOLS
(In Percentages)

| Types Of Counseling Services | Proprietary Status | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Public (N = 5) | Private (N = 20) | All (N = 25) |
| Determine Client's Interests and/or Occupational Goals | 20 | 10 | 12 |
| Advise Client On Appropriateness Of Interests and Goals | 20 | 5 | 8 |
| Advise Student Of Future Training Needs and Courses | 60 | 15 | 24 |
| Review Student's Progress In Training | 40 | 60 | 56 |
| Personal (Appearance, Attendance Problems) Or Psychological Counseling | 20 | 45 | 40 |
| Other | 20 | 20 | 20 |

had formally organized counseling offices staffed by professional personnel, this was seldom the case in the private schools. Only two or three of the private schools indicated they had staff personnel who were specifically assigned counseling duties. In most cases, counselors were primarily administrators. Pretraining counseling in the private schools was most likely to be an ad hoc part of the general admission interview. In-training counseling was most likely to be informal and occurred during everyday contacts between administrators and students or instructors and students. In only a few cases were students called in periodically for sessions explicitly concerned with counseling.

We do not intend, by these last comments, to imply judgement of the quality or effectiveness of counseling in either the public or private schools. Rather we simply want to point out that what is called counseling and the styles of counseling are quite different in the two categories of schools.

Placement Services

All but one of the schools said that they provided placement services to their graduating students (Table 8A).[5] The one exception was a small, business/commercial school.

TABLE 8A

PROPORTIONS OF SCHOOLS PROVIDING PLACEMENT SERVICES BY PROPRIETARY STATUS OF SCHOOLS (In Percentages)

| | Proprietary Status | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Public (N = 5) | Private (N = 22) | All (N = 27) |
| Provide Placement Services | 100 | 96 | 96 |

Four public schools reported maintaining a permanent placement center or having a full-time placement director (Table 8B). The placement activities at these large schools centered around maintaining files of job information and arranging interviews with employers. One school

[5]One of the schools that provided placement services (and is included in that category in our data) was a small business/commercial school that operated an employment bureau on the side. The placement services provided to the students of this school consisted of making the services of the employment bureau available to the students for a charge--but at a discount.

TABLE 8B

PROPORTIONS OF SCHOOLS MENTIONING VARIOUS TYPES OF PLACEMENT SERVICES BY PROPRIETARY STATUS OF SCHOOLS
(In Percentages)

| Placement Services | Proprietary Status | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Public (N = 5) | Private (N = 21) | All (N = 26) |
| Have Permanent Placement Center and/or Full-Time Placement Director | 80 | 19 | 31 |
| Maintain Job-Bank Services | 40 | 5 | 12 |
| Maintain Active Contact With Employers | - | 43 | 35 |
| Receive Requests From Employers For Qualified Job Applicants | - | 57 | 46 |
| Arrange Job Interviews For Graduates | 40 | 48 | 46 |
| Assist Graduates In Preparing Resumes | - | 5 | 4 |
| Provide Job-Seeking Skill Training | 20 | 10 | 12 |

reported that it offered job-seeking skill training and another said that a required course in job-seeking would soon be offered. Our impression was that the placement services offered by the public schools were, like the counseling services, predominantly on an as-desired basis.

Although all but one of the private schools said they provided placement services, only 4 reported having a permanent placement center or full-time placement director and only 1 reported maintenance of a "job bank." The placement services of the private schools frequently rest on the direct contacts which they have with employers. Nearly half said they maintained active contact with employers and more than half

said they regularly received requests from employers for qualified job applicants. During our interviews, a number of the respondents in private schools placed particular stress on their knowledge of and access to employers. As in the case of the public schools, arranging job interviews was the predominant action of the schools in helping their graduates to get jobs. Only 2 of the private schools reported providing job-seeking skill training and one school said that assistance in preparing a resume was given to each student who completed the program.

Our impression from talking with the respondents in the private schools was that while the placement services, like counseling, tended to be more informal than in the public schools, they also were considerably more personalized. This can be either an advantage or a disadvantage to the student. In many of our interviews, respondents in the private schools repeatedly evidenced special interest in students who had done particularly well or who had particularly attractive personalities. These students' cases were pointed out with pride by the respondents and we formed a rather strong impression that special efforts had been or would be made to place these students well.[6] The students with whom the staff have not formed such attachments might, on the other hand, be relatively disadvantaged at placement time.

At all of the public schools and at a considerable number of the private schools, we were impressed by what appeared to be a relatively sophisticated understanding of the employment problems of disadvantaged groups as well as a genuine concern for helping students to get ahead. We came away believing that these schools did make genuine efforts to

---

[6]The comments which gave us these impressions came up during the discussions of anonymous, individual WIN trainees. They suggest that the WIN trainees, in general, are not discriminated against in the schools.

place their students, in part because of the payoff in recruitment; but also because of more altruistic motives. There were, of course, some private schools in which placement efforts seemed to be pro forma but very few schools in which concern over placement appeared minimal.

Placement was clearly a sensitive topic for most of our respondents and many were quite reticent when it come to providing data on placement rates. As we mentioned earlier, the private schools recognize that their ability to place graduates in jobs is one of their most important selling points. But they also are most aware of recent FTC actions regarding truthfulness in advertising of training. Virtually every private school respondent said, as soon as we raised the subject of placement, "We cannot guarantee placement." But reticence about placement rates may not reflect evasiveness in all cases. The schools, public and private, find it difficult to establish placement rates for a number of reasons: there are usually some students who do not enter the labor market after completing training, some students leave the area or lose contact with the schools, and it is not always clear whether or not the graduate found a job or the school's efforts in his behalf were instrumental, etc. In any event, 3 of the public schools and 4 of the private schools could or would not give us data on placements. The schools that did give us placement rates usually characterized them as crude estimates at best. Of the 2 public schools that gave us placement rates, one cited a figure of 75 percent, the other 90 percent. The placement rates cited by the private schools which provided such information ranged from 25 percent to 100 percent (Table 9).[7]

[7]Because of the indeterminate validity of these data, we have not analyzed them further.

TABLE 9

SCHOOLS' ESTIMATES OF PLACEMENT RATES
BY PROPRIETARY STATUS OF SCHOOLS
(In Percentages)

| Percentage of Graduates Placed | Proprietary Status | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Public | Private | All |
| 20-29 | - | 5[a] | 4 |
| 30-39 | - | 5[b] | 4 |
| 40-49 | - | - | - |
| 50-59 | - | 9 | 7 |
| 60-69 | - | 5 | 4 |
| 70-79 | 20 | 9 | 11 |
| 80-89 | - | 14 | 11 |
| 90-99 | 20 | 23 | 22 |
| 100 | - | 14 | 11 |
| DK/NA | 60 | 18 | 26 |
| Total | 100 | 102 | 100 |
| (N) | (5) | (22) | (27) |

[a]School indicated that over half its students were from out of state.

[b]Real estate school said that many students took courses for one reason or another, but didn't take State examination and could not be placed.

At the time of our survey of schools, 33 vouchered WIN students had completed training courses. Of these, 73 percent had received placement assistance according to their schools. Of the completers, 50 percent got jobs after leaving school and two-thirds of those got their jobs with the school's assistance. We should note, in this respect, that

public schools were far less likely than private schools to know whether or not their completing WIN students got jobs.

The Schools' View of Themselves and Others

Because public and private schools are to an extent competitors, if not adversaries, the views schools have of their own operations and of the behavior of other training institutions are of considerable interest. Our data for this section are mainly impressionistic, sifted from our appraisals of comments made at various places during the personal interviews. In addition, however, we have some limited quantified data from the response to the general question, "What would you say are the pros and cons of the (vocational) training programs here as opposed to a (public/private) school with similar course work?"[8]

By and large, both types of schools assessed their qualities along the same dimensions, although they disagreed on who does the best on most of these qualities. The public schools saw themselves as the proper and legitimate providers of training. They emphasized the low cost of the training they provided as compared with that offered by private schools and they felt that their facilities, equipment and instructional staffs were superior. Particular emphasis was placed by several respondents on the fact that public schools did not just provide crash courses in specific occupational skills; they offered students a chance to take supporting courses that would broaden their educational

---

[8]The coded responses to this question are presented in Table 10. Due to problems inherent to the coding of such general questions, we have given substantially more importance to the substance of the responses to this question and merged these with other comments made during the personal interviews. No further tabulations of these data are presented.

TABLE 10

PROPORTIONS OF SCHOOLS MENTIONING ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS BY PRIOPRIETARY STATUS OF SCHOOLS
(In Percentages)

| Public Schools | Proprietary Status | | | Private Schools | Proprietary Status | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Public (N = 5) | Private (N = 22) | All (N = 27) | | Public (N = 5) | Private (N = 22) | All (N = 27) |
| ADVANTAGES | | | | ADVANTAGES | | | |
| Training Is Cheaper At Public Schools | 60 | 9 | 19 | Private Schools Have Better Facilities | - | 5 | 4 |
| Public Schools Have Better Financial Support | 40 | - | 7 | Private Schools Have Better Qualified Staffs | - | 9 | 7 |
| Public Schools Have Better Facilities | 60 | - | 11 | Frequent Training Cycles Facilitate Entrance | - | 5 | 4 |
| Public Schools Have Better Qualified Staffs | 60 | - | 11 | Instruction Is More Individualized | - | 50 | 41 |
| | | | | Continuous Counseling Or Tutoring Available | - | 9 | 7 |
| Instruction Is More Individualized | 20 | - | 4 | Atmosphere Is Less Bureaucratic | - | 5 | 4 |
| Continuous Counseling Or Tutoring Available | 20 | - | 4 | | | | |
| Atmosphere Is Less Bureaucratic | 20 | - | 4 | Greater Concentration On Occupational Skills | - | 32 | 26 |
| Provides Chance To Broaden Education | 40 | - | 7 | Training Is Geared To Labor Market | - | 9 | 7 |
| | | | | Courses Are Continuously Updated | - | 9 | 7 |
| Courses Are Continuously Updated | 20 | - | 4 | Better Opportunities For Job Placement | - | 18 | 15 |
| Better Opportunities For Job Placement | 40 | - | 7 | Good Reputation With Employers | - | 9 | 7 |
| Good Reputation With Employers | 20 | - | 4 | | | | |
| Students Exposed To A Range Of Occupations | 20 | - | 4 | Students Get Better Chance To Practice Actual Occupational Skills | - | 23 | 19 |
| | | | | Training Is Shorter At Private Schools | 20 | 27 | 26 |
| DISADVANTAGES | | | | | | | |
| | | | | DISADVANTAGES | | | |
| Fixed Schedule Prevents Students From Entering When They Want | 20 | 5 | 7 | | | | |
| | | | | Condensed Schedule Makes Absences More Damaging To Student's Progress | - | 5 | 4 |

background. The respondents at the public schools were impressive in the extent of their commitment to ameliorating social problems, but they also displayed a fairly realistic understanding of the problems faced by students trying to break out of welfare and into remunerative employment, as well as of the effects of such environmental factors as the state of the labor market. There is, however, a somewhat abstract, theoretical overtone to the comments of these respondents. Perhaps another way of characterizing them is as thoroughgoing professionals in looking at the role of education in relation to the problems faced by manpower program students.

In their attitudes toward the private schools, our public school respondents tend to adopt a noblesse oblige stance. There were few explicitly negative comments about private schools. In fact, the short, intensive training conducted by private schools was brought up several times and there was a grudging admission that for some trainees private schools might be suitable--particularly in cases where the student's situation required the quickest possible attainment of some employability skills. On the issue of possible venality on the part of some private schools, the public schools were probably more generous than were the private school respondents themselves. From data which will be presented more fully in Chapter VI, we note that 12 percent of the respondents at public schools agreed with a statement that WIN participants, if left on their own, might be talked into training which they did not want; 40 percent of the private school respondents held this opinion. On the other hand, the public school respondents were skeptical of the private schools' ability to adequately determine students' needs and abilities--and, in this case, there were some

imputations of venality to private schools. Sixty-two percent of the respondents at public schools (but also 52 percent of the private school respondents) felt that private schools might try to sell unsuitable training to WIN participants who were on their own in obtaining training.[9]

The private schools see themselves as much more pragmatic than public schools in their approach to vocational training. They feel strongly that it is the basic occupational skills that count most with employers and that public schools waste too much time in irrelevant, horizon-broadening courses. Almost without exception, the private schools saw themselves as specialists in their fields who understand the needs and evaluative standards of employers. They feel that their training is more realistic because more time is spent on actual practice of skills under realistic conditions.[10]

---

[9]The statements with which respondents were asked to agree or disagree were:

> If clients rather than counselors deal with the schools, they will be talked into training they really don't want or need.
>
> Some schools will try to sell training to clients which is not suited to their needs or abilities.

These statements do not specify private schools, but it was clear that our respondents, in agreeing or disagreeing with these statements, were doing so with reference to private schools.

[10]There may be some truth in this, particularly for some occupational categories. One of the industrial schools and all of the personal service schools operated ongoing businesses in conjunction with their training activities--students constitute all or part of their labor force. This was not as likely to be the case in public schools. As one beauty school owner put it, "Our students practice on real people here, not on mannequins like they do at _____ Community College."

The private schools also consider themselves particularly able to give students individual attention and flexible enough to reschedule and recycle courses to accommodate the personal problems which many of their students have.

In view of their emphasis on short, concentrated courses which stress practical skills as well as their individualized approach and flexibility, the private schools tend to see themselves as more appropriate than public schools for manpower program students who frequently need employment as soon as possible. The sort of liberal professionalism which we feel characterized the public school staff members with whom we talked was not very prevalent among the private school respondents. Although we were impressed by what appeared to be the genuine social welfare concerns of some of our private school respondents, many more displayed a more conventionally conservative approach toward students who had not achieved much occupational success. Nonetheless, most saw their job as turning out qualified graduates and all saw their methods as the best and most direct way of achieving this objective.

CHAPTER IV

## Matching Students with Training Occupations

Vouchering, of course, was intended as a mechanism for placing decisions about training occupations in the hands of WIN participants. By its very nature, vouchering implies acceptance of the assumption that WIN clients can assess their own capabilities and limitations, and make reasonable occupational choices. Nonetheless, there was persistent concern on the part of some people involved with planning of the vouchering study that some schools might exploit the opportunity to enroll students for training in manifestly inappropriate occupations or that some might alter their progress and tuition requirements solely to meet the time and cost limitations of the vouchering program.

Realistically, of course, there is some happy medium between no selectivity, no guidance, and rigorous screening and counseling that would deny students the chance to do what they want to do. It is reasonable to expect in this day that any responsible school, public or private, would at least advise a student whose self-selected goals were obviously and blatantly inappropriate. We would opt for providing students with good information coupled with effective availability of counseling and testing services. Beyond that, we would accept the risk of some false starts and some failures. Too rigorous an application of screening procedures would only extend the "creaming" already known to exist in WIN vocational training and deny training to those who most need it.

In this chapter, we examine our data for indication of the extent to which the schools sought to match students with the training occupations the schools thought most suitable, as well as for any suggestions that the schools might have altered their programs specifically to meet the limits of the vouchering procedures.[1]

As shown in the preceding chapter, the public schools (with the possible exception of the academic university) subscribed to open enrollment policies. Most private schools, on the other hand, expressed some concern that their entering students be sufficiently qualified to have a reasonable chance of training and subsequent employment success. We suggested that this difference in orientation contributed to the wider range of admission procedures which were used in the private schools. But despite the appearance of somewhat more rigorous application of admission criteria by private schools, refusal to enroll vouchered WIN registrants was rare. Four private schools said they had rejected vouchered WIN applicants. None of these schools was able to describe specific cases, but each said that no more than one or two applicants had been rejected.[2] None of the public schools had rejected vouchered WIN applicants.

Whether used to determine eligibility for enrollment or as a means for helping students select the most appropriate course and programs, predictive testing apparently is not a pervasive practice in

---

[1]Much of the information presented in this chapter is from the second part of the questionnaire--that part which asked the schools about individual WIN voucher students. Individual data could not be obtained for all of the vouchered WIN students. Numbers of missing cases are indicated in the various tables where appropriate.

[2]Respondents were quite indefinite on this point. It is entirely possible that they were thinking of earlier, regular WIN applicants rather than vouchered applicants.

either the public or private schools (Table 11). Moreover, where used, tests--particularly occupational aptitude tests--are likely to be highly specialized, nonstandardized, and frequently of the schools' own devising (Figure 3).

TABLE 11

PROPORTIONS OF SCHOOLS USING TESTS DURING ADMISSION PROCESS BY PROPRIETARY STATUS OF SCHOOLS[a] (In Percentages)

| Nature of Tests | Normal for All Applicants | | | Required in Special Cases | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Public (N = 5) | Private (N = 22) | All (N = 27) | Public (N = 5) | Private (N = 22) | All (N = 27) |
| General Intelligence Test | - | 5 | 4 | 20[c] | - | 4 |
| Educational Achievement Test | - | 5 | 4 | 60[c] | - | 11 |
| Occupational Aptitude Test | - | 27 | 22 | 60[d] | 14 | 22 |
| "Admission Analysis"[b] | - | 5 | 4 | - | - | - |
| Education/Aptitude Test for Nursing and Allied Health Applicants | - | - | - | 40 | -- | 7 |
| Education/Aptitude Tests for Forestry Applicants | - | - | - | 20 | -- | 4 |
| Voice Test for Radio/TV Broadcast Applicants | - | - | - | - | 9 | 7 |

[a]Excludes health examinations, blood tests and other "nonpredictive" requirements.

[b]Survey of applicant's hobbies and interests.

[c]Usually on recommendation of school's counselor.

[d]Usually on request of student.

| General Intelligence | Educational Achievement | Occupational Aptitude |
|---|---|---|
| Wonderlic Personnel Test | CQT | General Aptitude Test Battery |
| | Math/English Placement | Driver Analysis |
| | Scholastic Aptitude Test | Cosmetology Aptitude |
| | Educational Inventory | Data Processing Aptitude |
| | | Keypunch Aptitude |
| | | Dexterity Tests |
| | | Radio/TV Voice |
| | | General Clerical Test |
| | | Accounting Aptitude |

FIGURE 3

TESTS MENTIONED BY VARIOUS SCHOOLS
AS USED DURING ADMISSION PROCESS

We do not know on the basis of data obtained from the schools how many of the vouchered WIN students were tested or what tests they were given. Our best estimate is that roughly one-half of the vouchered WIN students attending private schools received some type of aptitude test. We are unable to make a useable estimate regarding the students in public schools partly because the schools themselves did not know in over half of the cases whether the students had been treated as "normal admissions" or "special cases."

By and large, where they felt they could make such an evaluation, the schools felt that their vouchered WIN students had made appropriate occupational choices (Table 12).[2]

[2]For the most part, our respondents appeared to base their evaluations of appropriateness largely on how well the student had done or was doing in the training program.

TABLE 12

APPROPRIATENESS OF VOUCHERED WIN STUDENTS' OCCUPATIONAL CHOICES AS APPRAISED BY SCHOOLS[a]

| Categories of Schools | Proportion of Those Evaluated Whose Choice Was Considered Appropriate | (N) | Number of Cases Not Evaluated (DK/NA) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Public | 79 | (19) | (46) |
| Private | 83 | (77) | ( 4) |
| Small | 93 | (14) | ( 1) |
| Medium | 81 | (63) | ( 3) |
| Large | 79 | (19) | (46) |
| Multiple | 79 | (19) | 39) |
| Business/Commercial | 82 | (45) | ( 3) |
| Medical and Dental Allied | 82 | (11) | ( -) |
| Personal Service | 67 | ( 3) | ( 1) |
| Industrial/Transportation | 89 | (18) | ( -) |
| Academic | - | ( -) | ( 7) |
| All | 82 | (96) | (50) |

[a]Excludes 22 vouchered WIN students for whom no individual data are available.

In most of the cases (92%) where occupational choices were considered inappropriate, the schools indicated that advice was given to the student concerned regarding program readjustments.

There were, in fact, some changes of programs. Out of the 146 cases for which we have individual data, three vouchered WIN students enrolled in an occupational program other than the one they had in mind when they sought acceptance and 9 changed occupations after their training started. All of these changes were downgradings or upgradings within the same occupational field. (Tables 13A and B). However, 8 of these program changes (4 upgradings and 4 downgradings) were made at a single school. In only a single case was a change attributed explicitly to the results of an aptitude test. Changes were predicated on the students' desires in roughly one-third of the cases. By and large, however, downgradings appear to have resulted from the student's inability to cope with aspects of the higher-level program. Upgradings appear to result most often from demonstrated ability and interest in some aspect of a lower-level course leading to specialization at a higher level.

The schools did make a few changes in the length and content of programs in which vouchered WIN students were enrolled. Ten such changes--all in private schools--were reported among the 141 persons for whom we have data (Figure 4). Five of these changes, 1 in length and 4 in content, were made in a single school. In addition to these changes reported by the schools, there were 2 cases where programs were extended

TABLE 13A

REASONS FOR AND TIMING OF CHANGES IN PROGRAM OF VOUCHERED WIN STUDENTS IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS[a]
(In Percentages)

| Reasons for and Timing of Changes | Private |
|---|---|
| Upgraded Prior to Training; Aptitude or Qualifications | 9 |
| Downgraded Prior to Training; Aptitude or Qualifications | 18 |
| Upgraded During Training; Interest or Aptitude Demonstrated in Lower Level Course | 45 |
| Downgraded During Training; Lack of Interest or Aptitude Demonstrated in Higher Level Course | 27 |
| Total | 99 |
| (N) | (11) |

[a]Only 1 case (upgraded during training) was reported in public schools.

TABLE 13B

OCCUPATIONS INVOLVED IN CHANGES OF PROGRAMS OF VOUCHERED WIN STUDENTS

UPGRADING

Automotive to Diesel Mechanic
Accounting to Data Processing
Bookkeeping to Data Processing
Keypunch to Automation Secretary
Professional Secretary to Automation Secretary
Dental Assistant to Dental Technician
General Secretary to Broadcast Secretary

DOWNGRADING

Data Processing to Bookkeeping/Keypunch
Accounting to Bookkeeping
Legal Secretary to Professional Secretary
Automation Secretary to Keypunch/General Business
Accounting to Bookkeeping

CHANGES IN LENGTH

Normal duration of program increased to accommodate student's child-care problem at home.

Normal duration of program increased to accommodate student's slower-than-average progress.

Student completed course and certification requirements early--student got job.

CHANGES IN CONTENT

Usual program modified to include more advanced, individual work commensurate with student's abilities.

Content added to program because student was completing normal requirements in less than the usual time.

Program requested by student was broadened to make it more useful.

Content added in a particular area in which student displayed high interest and excellent aptitude.

Typing added to normal program to make up for student's inability to meet 30 wpm prerequisite for basic program.

Certain parts of program repeated because of student's limited progress in those areas.

Original program was beyond student's capabilities--program modified to stress areas in which student had adequate capabilities.

FIGURE 4

CHANGES IN LENGTH AND CONTENT OF PROGRAMS
FOR VOUCHERED WIN TRAINEES

at a more advanced level beyong the contract period with the additional training being financed by means other than the original voucher.[4]

These data suggest that the schools, public and private, did not systematically and comprehensively determine the capabilities and qualifications of vouchered WIN students before enrolling them in the various vocational training programs. This suggestion is supported by our own impressionistic conclusions drawn from discussions with the schools' representatives. This is not to say that vocational training in these schools is a "rip-off"--that the schools will take anyone that comes along provided they can pay. The public schools' policy of not turning anyone away, the size of their student bodies, and the long-standing practice in post-secondary education of placing a great deal of responsibility on the student militate against the intensive and extensive testing, counseling, and guidance that would be necessary to assure fitting every student into exactly the right occupational niche. We are convinced that, in the private sector, in addition to their vested interest in producing employable graduates, most of the private schools are genuinely interested in their students. But this interest is usually manifested in relatively informal ways. Determinations of students' qualifications and abilities becomes an ad hoc process built into general interviewing and everyday review of the students' progress. We think too, that at a number of the private schools there is, over and above the need to recruit paying students, a reluctance to turn away applicants who evince interest in an occupation--a feeling that "these people should be given a chance."

---

[4]We can probably expect more extensions as time goes on or if vouchering is undertaken on a wider scale. In fact, the WIN office in Portland now has a number of no-cost extensions on file.

Under these circumstances, systematic determination of applicants' abilities and qualifications tends to become limited to occupations in which irreducible and measurable prerequisites can be defined clearly, or, in the case of public schools, where screening of applicants is adopted to prevent overcrowding of programs.

The end result, however, is that a number of students are entering vocational training with little or no assurance on anyone's part that they are capable of completing the training satisfactorily. But this is what vouchering is all about; the concept is based on assumptions that clients are capable of making their own choices. By and large, the vouchered students seemed to know what they wanted to do at the time they entered the WIN program.[5] Moreover, as we will show in the next chapter, appreciable numbers of the vouchered WIN students did well in vocational training. To be sure, a good number did not complete training, but dropping out cannot always be attributed to inability to cope with the content of training. The voucher system gives WIN registrants the opportunity to try to qualify for jobs they think they want and can do. Undoubtedly there were some who would not have survived rigorous testing but who nonetheless completed training and got jobs. The reverse is probably also true.

Finally, returning to our data for a moment, we found that most of the vouchered WIN students were in the normal training programs conducted by the schools. The few changes in program length or content that the schools told us about suggest that such changes generally reflect adaptations to the needs, interests and capabilities of particular students, and are not unusual. Thus up to this point in the vouchering

---

[5]Richardson and Sharp, op. cit., pp. 16-17.

experience, we found no evidence in the data obtained from the schools of program modification solely to exploit the voucher program.[6]

---

[6]WIN staff personnel, on the other hand, have told us that schools have, in a few cases, modified program costs to hold them under the ceiling set for the voucher program.

## CHAPTER V

### The Schools Look at Their Students

By using both the general data provided by us by the schools in Part A of the questionnaire and the available data on vouchered WIN trainees, we can begin to get a picture of how the schools look at their students. Our primary focus in this chapter will be on the vouchered WIN students, but we will also make some comparison with other groups of students.

### Vocational Programs

The vouchered WIN students were enrolled in programs leading to skill qualification in some 48 different occupations. Grouping these occupations into categories used by the U.S. Bureau of Census, we find that the largest proportion of students (42%) were enrolled for training in clerical occupations. The second largest category (25%) included various professional and technical occupations (Table 14).[1]

### Schools' Evaluations of Vouchered Student Performance

By and large, the schools indicated that they thought rather highly of vouchered WIN students. In the first place, the schools felt that most such students were in the best place to obtain vocational training. Overall, according to the schools' representatives, only

---

[1]A listing of the vocational training programs included in each of the categories can be found in Appendix C.

TABLE 14

VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS OF VOUCHERED WIN STUDENTS
BY PROPRIETARY STATUS OF SCHOOLS
(In Percentages)

| Vocational Programs | Proprietary Status | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Public | Private | All |
| Professional/Technical | 31 | 26 | 28 |
| Management/Administration | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| Clerical | 38 | 44 | 42 |
| Operatives, except Transport | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Transport Operatives | - | 7 | 4 |
| Service | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Other[a] | 8 | - | 3 |
| Total | 100 | 99 | 100 |
| (N) | (65) | (81) | (146) |

[a]Excludes 22 cases for which no individual data are available.

3 percent of the vouchered WIN students would have been better off in some other school (Table 15).[2]

[2]Obviously, there is bias involved in the responses to this question. When asked 'What about his/her choice of schools? Do you think that your training program is best suited for this student or would it be better if he/she were somewhere else?" A good many respondents laughed and said 'This is the best choice, of course." But some changed their response after thinking about it for a moment. One interesting twist was provided by a respondent at a public school who consistently said that students who had dropped out had made the correct choice in choosing that school because: "It would have been such a waste of money if he/she had gone to a more expensive private school and then dropped out."

TABLE 15

PROPORTIONS OF STUDENTS WHOM SCHOOLS FELT COULD BETTER OBTAIN VOCATIONAL TRAINING ELSEWHERE
(In Percentages)

| Categories of Schools | Proportion Better Off Elsewhere | Number of Cases Not Evaluated (DK/NA) | (N) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Public | - | (47) | (18) |
| Private | 4 | ( 5) | (76) |
| Small | 14 | ( 1) | (14) |
| Medium | 2 | ( 4) | (62) |
| Large | - | (47) | (18) |
| Multiple | - | (40) | (18) |
| Business/Commercial | - | ( 1) | (47) |
| Medical and Dental Allied | 20 | ( 1) | (10) |
| Personal Service | - | ( -) | ( 4) |
| Industrial/Transportation | 7 | ( 3) | (15) |
| Academic | - | ( 7) | ( -) |
| All | 3 | (52) | (94) |

When asked to evaluate the performance of individuals on various criteria of performance in training, the schools rated two-thirds of the vouchered WIN students as average or above average on class performance (Table 16)--44 percent were rated above average. Large majorities of the

WIN students for whom data were available also received average or higher ratings on the other performance criteria.[3]

TABLE 16

PROPORTIONS OF VOUCHERED WIN STUDENTS FOR WHOM DATA WERE AVAILABLE WHO WERE EVALUATED AVERAGE OR ABOVE AVERAGE ON SELECTED CRITERIA OF PERFORMANCE

| Performance Criteria | Percent Average or Above Average | (N) |
|---|---|---|
| Class Performance | 79 | (128) |
| General Aptitudes and Abilities | 91 | ( 79) |
| Attendance | 73 | ( 80) |
| Motivation | 89 | ( 74) |

By and large, then, the schools felt that their vouchered WIN students were in the right place for training and substantial proportions were considered to be doing well in their work. Aside from these more or less specific evaluative data, our respondents quite frequently added complimentary remarks about particular students as they were going through their lists. To be sure, there were also some uncomplimentary remarks about a few students; the latter were usually made in tones of regret, and the overall impression we obtained was that the respondents were generally pleased with the progress of the vouchered WIN students.

These generally high opinions of vouchered WIN students were not contradicted when we approached the question from the negative aspect.

[3]Three public schools could not or would not provide this information at the time of interview. One of these schools later compiled data on "overall performance" which are included in the "class performance" category in Table 16.

For example, we asked the schools if they had encountered any major problems with the vouchered WIN students themselves. Only one public school and seven private schools said that they had encountered such problems. Moreover, the respondents at these schools indicated that the problems had not been with vouchered students as a class, but with certain individuals. Inadequate counseling and lack of clear objectives on the part of a few WIN students was the predominant complaint at the public school. Bad attendance records and the personal problems of students were clearly uppermost in the minds of respondents at the private schools. Further, these two sets of problems were seen as interrelated because personal problems--most often, sickness of the student or some member of the family, or lack of childcare services--frequently caused attendance problems.

Despite the concern with attendance problems expressed by the schools, over half of the schools in every category of school said that the attendance of students from manpower programs, including vouchered WIN students, was equal to or better than that of all other vocational students.[4]

Dropping Out

Data on the dropout rate for vouchered WIN students as well as on reasons for dropping out will not, of course, be available until all of the vouchered students are out of training and posttraining

---

[4]In responding to a question as to what effect the elimination of manpower program requirements for certification of attendance would have, several private school respondents said that certification served little purpose. They were quite emphatic in saying that they insisted on regular attendance because of the intensive nature of their training and that they checked up immediately on any absentee. Our public school respondents, on the other hand, tended to see attendance problems as the concern of instructors and were much more likely than private school respondents to predict a decline in attendance if certification requirements were removed. Special certification of attendance was not required in the voucher program.

interviews have been completed. Nonetheless, data obtained from the schools provide insights into the way the schools view the dropout phenomenon.

Although substantial proportions of the schools were unable to make comparisons, not very many felt that vouchered WIN students were particularly prone to dropping out. Only 1 out of 4 schools said that manpower students dropped out more frequently than vocational students in general and only 1 out of 10 thought that vouchered students dropped out more frequently than manpower students (Table 17).

At the time of the survey of schools, the schools' records indicated that some 31 percent of the vouchered students had left before completing their vocational training. Of these, 9 percent were asked to leave, 60 percent left of their own volition, and responsibility was not fixed in the remaining cases. The 9 percent explusion rate translates into a 3 percent rate for all vouchered students which compares quite favorably with the overall explusion rate for all vocational students reported by the schools.[5]

According to the information which the schools had, personal problems predominated among the reasons for which vouchered students left before completing training; 37 percent left for such reasons (Table 18).

---

[5]All of the 4 vouchered students who were expelled by their schools were expelled from medium-sized, private schools: one by a business/commercial school for lack of aptitude, one by an industrial/transportation school for lack of interest, and two by business/commercial schools because of attendance problems.

TABLE 17

SCHOOLS' COMPARISONS OF ESTIMATED DROPOUT RATES OF ALL VOCATIONAL STUDENTS, MANPOWER PROGRAM STUDENTS AND VOUCHERED WIN STUDENTS
(In Percentages)

| Categories of Schools | Manpower vs. All Vocational Students | | | | Voucher vs. Manpower Students | | | (N) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Manpower Higher | Manpower Same | Manpower Lower | DK/NA | Voucher Higher | Voucher Same | DK/NA | |
| Public | 40 | 20 | - | 40 | 20 | 20 | 60 | ( 5) |
| Private | 23 | 27 | 18 | 32 | 9 | 18 | 73 | (22) |
| Small | 18 | 36 | 27 | 18 | 9 | 9 | 82 | (11) |
| Medium | 27 | 18 | 9 | 45 | 9 | 27 | 64 | (11) |
| Large | 40 | 20 | - | 40 | 20 | 20 | 60 | (5) |
| Multiple | 20 | 20 | - | 60 | 20 | 20 | 60 | (5) |
| Business/Commercial | 30 | 20 | 20 | 30 | 10 | 20 | 70 | (10) |
| Medical & Dental Allied | 50 | - | - | 50 | - | 50 | 50 | (2) |
| Personal Service | 17 | 33 | 33 | 17 | 17 | - | 83 | (6) |
| Industrial/Transportation | - | 67 | - | 33 | - | 33 | 67 | (3) |
| Academic | 100 | - | - | - | - | - | 100 | (1) |
| All | 26 | 26 | 15 | 33 | 11 | 19 | 70 | (27) |

TABLE 18

REASONS VOUCHERED STUDENTS DROPPED OUT OF TRAINING ON OWN INITIATIVE ACCORDING TO SCHOOLS' INFORMATION BY PROPRIETARY STATUS OF SCHOOLS[a]
(In Percentages)

| | Proprietary Status of School From Which Dropped Out | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Public | Private | All |
| Work Was Too Difficult | 17 | - | 4 |
| Needed an Income | - | 19 | 15 |
| Preferred Working | - | 5 | 4 |
| Personal Problems | - | 48 | 37 |
| Other | 17 | 14 | 15 |
| Student Gave No Reason | 33 | 14 | 19 |
| DK/NA | 33 | - | 7 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 101 |
| (N) | (6) | (21) | (27) |

[a]Excludes 22 vouchered WIN students for whom no individual data are available.

The schools' representatives indicated that child-care requirements and illnesses, either of the student or in the family, were quite frequently involved in these personal problems. In two of these cases, students had been injured in automobile accidents and their schools expected and hoped that they would return following recovery. Although we cannot give a conclusive judgement on this issue, it is our impression that the schools quite frequently consider these dropouts to be victims of circumstance; a concommitant impression is that a number of the schools,

particularly the private schools, make a considerable effort to accommodate students who encounter problems so that they can stay in training. Nonetheless, we talked to a few private school operators who accepted dropping out by students as an inevitable consequence of a welfare system.

## CHAPTER VI

### The Schools Look at Vouchering

In this final chapter, we examine briefly the experiences the schools had with vouchering and how they reacted to it. It is important to remember, however, that the procedural changes which WIN made for the administration of vocational training at the outset of the vouchering demonstration were not announced to the schools in advance. It is also apparent that many of our respondents did not understand what was behind the changes they did notice. It sometimes was difficult to determine whether the respondents are talking about vouchering *per se*, or about WIN vocational training in general. Moreover, some of the reactions we will report seem to be directed more toward the hypothetical context of some of our questions than to actual experience with vouchering.

### Experienced Advantages and Disadvantages

We mentioned in the previous chapter that only a few of the schools experienced major problems with vouchered WIN students. Moreover, those problems that the schools did encounter were generally of an individual nature rather than problems ascribed to WIN participants as a distinct group.

An equal proportion (30%) of the schools reported difficulties associated with the financing and billing system or related administrative matters.[1] (See Table 19).

---

[1]Eight schools reported problems in each of the two categories--problems with WIN students and billing/administrative problems. But only 2 of these schools reported problems in both categories. Apparently these data do not reflect negative biases of the respondents.

TABLE 19

PROPORTIONS OF SCHOOLS STATING THAT BILLING AND RELATED PROBLEMS WERE ENCOUNTERED DURING THE VOUCHERING DEMONSTRATION
(In Percentages)

| Categories of Schools | Percent With Problems | (N) |
|---|---|---|
| Public | 20 | (5) |
| Private | 32 | (22) |
| Small | 36 | (11) |
| Medium | 27 | (11) |
| Large | 20 | (5) |
| Multiple | 20 | (5) |
| Business/Commercial | 40 | (10) |
| Medical & Dental Allied | 50 | (2) |
| Personal Service | 33 | (6) |
| Industrial/Transportation | - | (3) |
| Academic | - | (1) |
| All | 30 | (27) |

Probably the most serious problem reported was related directly to vouchering, but was of a correctable nature. One community college enrolled a student on the basis of the voucher, not realizing that subsequent execution of a Training Agreement was necessary to commit WIN to payment. Although enrolled, the student failed to attend any classes but, since a space had been reserved for the student, the college billed WIN. WIN declined payment because no Training Agreement had been executed. The case resulted in extensive correspondence and a threat of legal action by the college. Ultimately, however, a WIN representative was able to clear up the misunderstanding and an amicable settlement was

reached.[2] The only other complaint directly attributable to vouchering did not involve financial matters. One school complained that an applicant appeared on the final day for voucher commitment. In order for the school to enroll the student, it was necessary for the admissions staff to drop other activities in order to complete the applicant's paperwork the same day.

The remaining problems reported by the schools all involved some aspect of the billing and payment system: unpredictability of WIN funding, slowness of payment, failure to provide a tool purchase grant to a student at the time of enrollment, and periodicity of billing. (See Figure 5).[3] These complaints do not necessarily relate directly to vouchering; it is not clear whether the schools involved directed them at the vouchering program or at WIN in general. We think from the context that the latter is more likely.

Only one school stated unequivocally that the vouchered system was easier to administer than the conventional system. One additional school said that there was no difference between the two systems. Two other comments were favorable to WIN but did not clearly indicate reference to vouchering. All of the remaining schools simply said that there were no problems with the financial or billing systems.

In essence, then, comparisons of the vouchering and conventional administrative and financial aspects of the systems by the schools indicated no particularly difficult problems.

---

[2] Cognizance has been taken of this case in designing vouchers for use in future projects.

[3] One additional school reported no problems but said that they would prefer to bill on a quarterly rather than a monthly basis.

- Inadequately worded vouchers resulted in enrollment of student without contract. Dispute over payment of bill ensued.

- School's billing is on quarterly basis--WIN wanted monthly billing. Also, WIN made no provision for funding for required supplies.

- Funding is sporadic--the school never knows what WIN policy will be; allowed expenses vary from student to student. CETA is better.

- WIN wouldn't provide a tool grant soon enough--school had to provide tools and absorb cost for several months.

- WIN ran out of money and didn't pay total cost of training. Student had to pay rest out of pocket.

- WIN is sometimes a little slow in paying.

- Cumbersome, duplicate forms. Lag time in getting payment is longer for WIN.

- Voucher deadline caused school to drop everything to do necessary paperwork.

FIGURE 5

TYPES OF BILLING AND RELATED PROBLEMS
ENCOUNTERED BY SCHOOLS

Reactions to Training Time and Cost Limits

In the Portland vouchering program, certain limits were placed on the cost, length and type of training for which vouchers could be used.[4] We asked our respondents at the schools for their reactions to the length-of-training and cost limitations.

The strongest reaction to the one-year time limit came from the public schools, all of whom agreed that the period was too short. (See Table 20.) Without exception, the representatives of these schools argued

[4] WIN students could not use their vouchers for training which would last more than one year; there was no limit on cost, but any training program which would cost more than $2500 would require approval of the DOL Assistant Regional Director for Manpower; in general, there were no restrictions on the occupations for which WIN students could seek training, but training of a purely avocational or recreational type was proscribed.

TABLE 20

PROPORTIONS OF SCHOOLS RECORDING VARIOUS REACTIONS TO LIMITS IMPOSED ON THE PORTLAND VOUCHERING DEMONSTRATION
(In Percentages)

| Categories of Schools | 1-Year Training Period | | | | | $2500 Cost | | | (N) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Too Long | Reasonable | Too Short | Provide For Individual Extensions | Should Vary With Occupation | More Than Adequate | Reasonable | Should Vary With Occupation | |
| Public | - | - | 100 | 40 | 20 | 60 | 40 | - | (5) |
| Private | 9 | 50 | 23 | - | 36 | 41 | 36 | 18 | (22) |
| Small | 9 | 55 | 27 | - | 45 | 45 | 27 | 27 | (11) |
| Medium | 9 | 45 | 18 | - | 27 | 36 | 45 | 9 | (11) |
| Large | - | - | 100 | 40 | 20 | 60 | 40 | - | (5) |
| Multiple | - | - | 80 | 40 | 20 | 60 | 20 | - | (5) |
| Business/Commercial | 10 | 60 | 20 | - | 10 | 40 | 40 | 20 | (10) |
| Medical & Dental Allied | - | 50 | 50 | - | - | 50 | 50 | - | (2) |
| Personal Service | 17 | 33 | 33 | - | 83 | 50 | 33 | 17 | (6) |
| Industrial/Transportation | - | 67 | - | - | 67 | 33 | 33 | 33 | (3) |
| Academic | - | - | 100 | - | - | - | 100 | - | (1) |
| All | 7 | 41 | 37 | 7 | 33 | 44 | 37 | 15 | (27) |

that the normal academic program was 2 (or in the case of the academic university, 4) years and that to fund students for only one year could only serve to whet appetites and increase frustration.[5] There was some argument at these schools about whether the overall limit should be increased to two years, or a basic limit of 1 year (for a "diagnostic/trial" period as one respondent put it) maintained with provision for an additional year's extension if the student had performed well. Although favoring an increase so that a normal academic program could be completed, one respondent at the academic university felt that the vouchering program with a 1-year limit still had merit because it gave the students a chance to complete at least part of an academic education.[6]

Complete programs are generally much shorter in the private vocational schools than in community colleges and universities. It is understandable that half of the private schools thought that the 1-year limit was reasonable. But one quarter of the private schools thought the limit was too restrictive; some had combinations of programs that could last longer than a year, and some brought up explicitly the problem of WIN students who were attending academic institutions. Only 2 schools, both private, thought that a 1-year limit was too generous. Both public and private schools mentioned the possibility of relating length-of-training limitations to the requirements of various occupations and several schools thought that extensions should be permitted in individual cases.

---

[5] It should be noted though that the community colleges do have specific vocational programs leading to certification in an occupation which do not last 2 years. Nonetheless, they consider 2 years as the normal program.

[6] As a matter of fact, other data available to us suggest that some of the participants in the voucher program did use various means to finance segments of their academic careers. For them, WIN provided for 1 year--other programs could be found to cover additional periods, either before or after the vouchered training period.

A sizeable majority of the schools in each category thought that $2,500 was either "more than adequate" or reasonable for training.[7] Again, however, a few private schools suggested that cost limits be related to occupations.

Several provisions of WIN regulations are aimed at insuring that institutional training is oriented toward increasing occupational eligibility, and the procedures for the vouchering project prohibited training of a purely avocational nature. A question relating to this restriction was dropped early in the interviewing process because it was seen by so many respondents as irrelevant. However, our general discussions with the respondents suggest that they accept and understand the principle of focusing on training that will increase employability. Private schools, as we have mentioned, see employment of their graduates as an important selling point and some, at least, attempt to adjust to labor market conditions. For example, one medium-sized, business/commercial school described in detail its attempts to dissuade women from enrolling in a course for airline and travel secretaries. This is a popular choice among applicants to the school, but the field is overcrowded in the Portland area.[8]

---

[7]Many of the respondents used terms such as "more than adequate" or "more than enough for our programs" in describing this limit. At the same time, a number of them recognized that costs for certain programs at other schools might be higher. None of the respondents felt that a lower, absolute limit should be set.

[8]The school had not refused to enroll one WIN applicant for this course, however, and the respondent was quite embarassed when this case turned up in the data on individual WIN students.

Our impression is that the public schools also accept the need for a pragmatic approach to increasing employability, but tend to put a broader interpretation on what is likely to accomplish this goal. Thus, courses aimed at broadening the student's educational background are seen as supporting purely vocational courses and enhancing the student's longer-run chances of employment success. The academic institution was, *of course, the least oriented toward immediate employ*-ment of the life chances of students who completed degrees.

By and large, then, none of the schools found the cost limit to be restrictive. But the public schools and about a quarter of the private schools found the length-of-training limit restrictive. Most of the schools apparently had no problems with the employability enhancement policies of WIN, partially because the policies are consistent with the views of the private schools and partially because they have been interpreted liberally in the past. But interpretations of what enhances employability are likely to vary with educational philosophy and we feel sure that the public schools, at least, would resist too restrictive a regulation.

Attitudes Toward Vouchering

Two questions in our interview schedule were aimed at determining the respondents' reactions to the vouchering concept as such.

First, we read a statement about the vouchering concept to the respondents and asked how they felt about the notion.[9]

---

[9]The following statement was read to respondents:

> Traditionally, the manpower agency has decided who will get vocational training and also has played a major role in deciding the occupational area and training institution in which the client would be trained.
> Under the voucher system, however, client choice of occupation and school is crucial. How does this system seem to you?

The respondents' comments indicate that substantial proportions of the schools thought that vouchering was a good idea (Table 21). This was somewhat more likely to be the case among public than among private schools. But among both those who agreed with the vouchering idea and those who felt it was not a good idea, a substantial proportion felt that WIN students needed more counseling and screening. This, in fact, was the major reason for not liking the vouchering idea.

We also asked for agreement or disagreement on a series of statements about what might happen if vouchering were to be initiated on a wide scale.[10]

In general, we think that the responses to this question (Table 22) reflect the "helping people" orientations of many of the respondents, particularly those from public schools. Such an orientation is likely to be associated with heightened concern about the consequences for WIN students of the "wrong" decisions they might make as well as concern about wasted funds. Counselors and administrators with this sort of strong sense of responsibility for others and a professional orientation which emphasizes the use of intervention skills are likely to be somewhat disturbed by a concept which minimizes intervention and throws a greater share of responsibility on clients.

---

[10]The prefatory statement read to respondents was:

> There's been some talk of using vouchers on a broader scale, but there are some differences of opinion about the effectiveness of the program. Here is what some people would say happen if the voucher system were to replace the existing one. How about you, do you agree or disagree with these statements? Additional comments are welcome.

For this set of data we have included the responses of both primary and secondary respondents. Further, since some respondents neither agreed nor disagreed but made more substantive comments, all responses were recorded into the following categories: Agree; Disagree; It all depends on the individual student; and Vouchering would make no difference.

TABLE 21

PROPORTIONS OF SCHOOLS REACTING IN VARIOUS WAYS TO THE VOUCHERING CONCEPT AND THE IDEA OF ALLOWING WIN REGISTRANTS TO CHOOSE OWN SCHOOL AND OCCUPATION
(In Percentages)

| Reactions | Proprietary Status | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Public (N = 5) | Private (N = 22) | All (N = 27) |
| AGREE WITH VOUCHERING | | | |
| Success Rate Would Be Higher If Students Make Own Choice | 40 | 36 | 37 |
| Student Can Investigate and Choose Best Program | - | 27 | 22 |
| Agree, but Students Need More Counseling and Better Screening | 40 | 27 | 30 |
| DISAGREE WITH VOUCHERING | | | |
| Students Need Much More Counseling and Screening | 20 | 14 | 15 |
| Opposed to All Publicly Funded Training Programs | - | 5 | 4 |
| NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE | | | |
| No Difference--WIN Always Gave Clients a Choice of Training and Occupation | - | 5 | 4 |
| It All Depends on the Initiative and Maturity of the Student | 20 | - | 4 |
| Students Hesitate to Take Anything Less Than the Maximum They Want because They Are Afraid Funds Will Run Out | - | 5 | 4 |

TABLE 22

SUMMARY OF SCHOOL REPRESENTATIVES' RESPONSES TO STATEMENTS ABOUT VOUCHERING

| | Public Schools (N = 8) | | | | Private Schools (N = 27) | | | | All Schools (N = 35) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Agree | Dis-Agree | It Depends | No Difference | Agree | Dis-Agree | It Depends | No Difference | Agree | Dis-Agree | It Depends | No Difference |
| STATEMENTS SUPPORTING CLIENT AUTONOMY | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Manpower clients would make occupational decisions which are just as good as those made by manpower training counselors. | 25 | 38 | - | - | 30 | 26 | 11 | - | 37 | 29 | 9 | - |
| Manpower clients would be able to select a vocational training school just as wisely as the counselors. | 12 | 62 | 12 | - | 22 | 44 | 11 | - | 25 | 48 | 11 | - |
| STATEMENTS IMPLYING CLIENT DEPENDENCY | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| If clients are left on their own, they may choose occupations for which there is little or no chance of being employed. | 88 | - | - | - | 52 | 19 | - | - | 60 | 14 | - | - |
| If clients rather than counselors deal with the schools, they will be talked into training that they really don't want or need. | 12 | 75 | - | - | 44 | 33 | 4 | - | 34 | 43 | 3 | - |
| Some schools will try to sell training to clients which is not suited to their needs or abilities. | 62 | 12 | - | - | 52 | 26 | - | - | 54 | 23 | - | - |
| AUTONOMY WILL HAVE ADVANTAGEOUS OUTCOMES | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Decision-making by the client would increase his self-esteem. | 38 | 75 | 12 | - | 74 | 4 | - | - | 66 | 9 | 3 | - |
| Decision-making by the client would increase his motivation to successfully complete training. | 38 | 50 | - | - | 62 | 4 | 7 | - | 60 | 14 | 6 | - |
| Students would be more comfortable, because it would not be so obvious to school personnel, teachers, or other students that they are "poor" or "on welfare". | 38 | 12 | - | 25 | 33 | 19 | 4 | 22 | 34 | 17 | 3 | 23 |
| AUTONOMY WILL HAVE DISADVANTAGEOUS OUTCOMES | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Since the training is paid for by the government, the clients may choose expensive schools, even though equally effective training would be available elsewhere at a lower cost. | 50 | 25 | - | - | 37 | 30 | 4 | - | 40 | 29 | 3 | - |
| OTHER | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The voucher system would reduce administrative paper work. | 12 | 38 | 12 | - | 37 | 30 | - | 4 | 31 | 31 | 3 | 3 |

NOTE: DK/NA's not shown.

In this context, it is not surprising that neither public nor private school respondents display a great deal of confidence in WIN participants' abilities to make viable occupational and training choices. There is only modest agreement with statements supporting client autonomy and roughly equal or higher disagreement with such statements. On the other hand, there is relatively high agreement with statements implying client dependency and low to modest disagreement with such statements. The respondents from public schools appear to be somewhat less confident of the clients' abilities to choose for themselves than are the private school respondents. There is, however, one major exception. Three-quarters of the public school respondents did not think that WIN students would be talked into training they do not want or need. These responses seem inconsistent with the pattern of responses to the other statements by public school respondents as well as with the responses from the private schools' representatives. Since the private school respondents did not display this same apparent reversal of attitude, we cannot attribute it to an artifact of the statement. We suggest that the public schools' representatives are saying that they have relatively low confidence in the clients' abilities to select appropriate occupations, low confidence in the clients' abilities to select appropriate training, and low confidence in the motives and honesty of private schools. But they do have high confidence in the clients' abilities to withstand a hard sell of training which is not what the clients have decided they want. In short, we think the public school respondents are saying that they do not think the clients can make as good choices as counselors can, but once they have made a choice, they will stick to it. The private schools, on the other hand, display a bit more confidence in the clients' ability to make viable choices,

but are much less sanguine than the public school respondents about the clients' ability to withstand a hard sell.

The attitudes of the respondents toward the ability of WIN participants to choose appropriate occupations seems, however, to be at variance with the reported behavior of the vouchered WIN students who had enrolled in their schools. We showed in Chapter IV that 79 percent of the public schools and 83 percent of the private schools evaluated their WIN students' occupational choices as appropriate. Yet 88 percent of the public school respondents and 52 percent of the private school respondents think that if vouchering is instituted on a wide scale clients may choose occupations for which there is little chance of being employed; 38 percent of the public school and 26 percent of the private school respondents do not think that clients can make occupational decisions that are as good as those of counselors.

In part, this apparent contradiction may result from the respondents' propensity for judging the appropriateness of their students' occupational choices on the basis of how well they did in training. But we also think there is evidence of a "but not you" syndrome--of stereotyping--here. We believe that the respondents have a tendency to impute lower orders of judgement and ability to unknown WIN students in general than to those with whom they have had personal contact. A policy implication of this is that initial doubts over WIN clients' abilities to make their own choices may be largely overcome if and when vouchering is implemented on a wider scale. For this reason, initial resistance to a modest expansion of vouchering should probably not be taken too seriously.

Very clearly, the private school respondents are more sanguine than those from the public schools over the likelihood of advantageous outcomes to be expected from giving clients greater freedom of choice.

Large majorities of the private school respondents feel that freedom of choice would increase the students' self-esteem and motivation to succeed in training. This is not so of the public school respondents. We are not sure why these differences exist, but suspect that they may result from differences in the sizes and structural characteristics of the two classes of schools. It may be that respondents at the public schools are more sensitive to objective, bureaucratic criteria such as grades than are private school respondents, and that the latter, operating in closer everyday contact with students, are more sensitive to subjective phenomena such as self-esteem and motivation. To the private school respondent in daily, face-to-face contact with students, motivation and self-esteem are likely to be more than abstract concepts.

One of the arguments frequently made in favor of vouchering in programs for the disadvantaged is that, by recasting agency clients in the role of independent "purchasers" of services, it will minimize the stigmatization as welfare clients, seen as contributing to low self-esteem One-third of the respondents agreed that vouchering would make WIN students feel more comfortable since they would not be identifiable as "poor" or "on welfare," and less than one-fifth disagreed. Most interestingly, though, roughly one-quarter of the respondents said that vouchering would not make any difference simply because they did not see stigmatization as a problem in the conventional system. As we mentioned in Chapter II, most respondents did not feel that WIN students were singled out as "different"--in the large schools because students are lost in the crowd and, in the smaller schools, because everyone is seeking to improve employability.

Finally, the remaining finding we think worthy of comment here is that few respondents felt that vouchering would reduce administrative

paperwork. Private school respondents were more likely than those from public schools to see administrative advantages in vouchering, but those taking this position were still in the minority.

## CHAPTER VII

### Summary and General Conclusions

This report has presented the results of a survey of 27 schools, 5 public and 22 private, in which WIN registrants were enrolled for vocational training during the vouchering feasibility test in Portland, Oregon. Our data include the responses of school representatives to an interview schedule which asked about the schools, their operations, their reactions to the vouchering program and, additionally, what the schools said about some 146 of the 168 WIN registrants who had spent their training vouchers in the schools. We have frequently supplemented quantitative analysis of our data with qualitative interpretations of our discussions with the schools' representatives.

We found rather pervasive differences in the responses of public and private schools on a number of measures. We attribute these differences in large part to differences in the size, organizational structures, and training philosophies of the two categories of schools.

The large, public schools operate under a mandate to provide educational and training services to the widest possible spectrum of the population. Their policy, in general, is one of open enrollment and their approach to training seems to fall well within the ethos of the educational profession. Although there is a high level of social concern and commitment to social programs, so far as we are able to judge from our discussions, the size and bureaucratic style of organization in these schools appear to contribute to a certain impersonality and *laissez-faire* reliance on the student's own efforts and initiatives.

The private schools seem to us to be more pragmatic in their orientation toward vocational training. Profit-oriented for the most part, these schools recognize that the placement of qualified graduates in jobs is one of their major selling points. Therefore, they tend to be acutely sensitive to what they see as the essential needs and interests of employers, and they tend to put the emphasis on providing their students with basic occupational skills in the shortest possible time. This pragmatic orientation, as well as smaller establishments and much smaller student bodies, contribute to more frequent reliance on personal contact and greater informality in counseling and placement activities. By the same token, the private schools are more insistent on attendance and more likely to follow-up quickly when a student appears to be having problems. For these private schools, qualifying their students for employment in the shortest practicable time is the principal goal. And, at least in their view, their preparation of students must be adequate if the schools are to maintain their standing with employers and the community.

By and large, both public and private schools gave favorable evaluations of students from the WIN program, including the vouchered students. But the shift to vouchering itself did not seem to have made much difference to the schools, and the idea of vouchering--of increasing the freedom of WIN clients to make their own decisions--evoked mixed responses from the schools. Although there were only a few cases in which the schools had encountered students who were not prepared to make viable decisions, there is a fairly strong tendency for school personnel to assume that people from WIN, or presumably any other manpower program, need extensive screening and counseling.

In both the public and private schools, we think, there is generally a high level of interest in the welfare and success of students. Both categories of schools seem genuinely committed to their particular philosophies and styles of training over and above the structural and motivational factors that give rise to the differences. For the most part, our respondents in both categories of schools impressed us as genuinely convinced that their method was best for their students and they appear to work hard to adapt their particular systems to the needs of their students. To be sure, we came away with questions in our minds about two or three of the private schools, schools whose representatives did not convince us of the high degree of concern and commitment that we have just described. By and large, however, we think that most of the schools are trying to do a good job--in somewhat different ways.

Our observations support Wilms'[1] initial contention that the settings in which public and private schools provide vocational training are conceptually different. Wilms argues that the private schools' "dependent relationship on output markets," contrasted with the dependence of public schools on the "political process," results in differences between the two types on a number of factors, including:

| Private Schools | Public Schools |
|---|---|
| Emphasis on employment qualification | Multiple objectives and requirements for nonemployment academic work |
| Selection of students with high placement probability | Open-enrollment with some internal selection |
| Greater flexibility to meet student and employer needs | Less flexibility in meeting student and employer needs |
| Greater emphasis on job placement | Less emphasis on job placement |

[1]Wellford W. Wilms, Public and Proprietary Vocational Training: A Study of Effectiveness, Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1974.

We have made similar points on the basis of the information we gathered. We cannot draw any conclusions as to whether or not these differences make one type of school 'better' than the other, nor can we confirm or refute any of Wilms' evaluative findings. But we submit that the existence of these differences is important because either set of characteristics may be advantageous for some students and not for others.

Our conclusions are, of course, based on the data which representatives of the various schools gave us and on the impressions we formed while talking with these respondents. We now have a much better feel for how the schools involved in the vouchering demonstration interpret their own operations and how they look at the vocational training situation, though.

Beyond that, we know that the voucher system, per se, posed no particular problems for the schools. We think that this specific finding can be generalized to a larger population of schools with sufficient confidence that vouchering of institutional training can be applied on a wider scale without undue concern on that point.

Moreover, the schools so far do not seem to have behaved unethically or in an exploitative manner with respect to vouchering; the private schools, about which concern is most often expressed, apparently did not tailor courses especially for the program, they profess reasonable insistence on attendance and performance standards, and there is some screening aimed at preventing students from pursuing inappropriate training objectives. At the same time, one cannot conclude from this that problems will not arise if vouchers do become available on a larger scale and over a longer period of time.

It may be that the vouchered students' views of the schools and of the training they received will be somewhat different than the story we got from the schools. And any attempt at evaluating the effectiveness of training, whether on the dimension of vouchering/nonvouchering or on the dimension of type of school, will have to await analysis of posttraining labor force experience. Nonetheless, we would be less than truthful if we did not admit that, in addition to establishing the feasibility of vouchering from the schools' standpoint and describing a number of relevant aspects of vouchered vocational training, we have gained an impression that is favorable to the private schools. We believe at this point that replications of the vouchering demonstration on a wider scale should not be inhibited by concerns about the motives and methods of most private schools.

# APPENDIX A

## FACTORS LIMITING THE SCOPE OF THE DATA

As we mentioned in the main body of this report, certain design features of the study as well as several reality constraints imposed limitations on the scope of the data collected. The factors which contributed to this limitation are outlined below. We did not, in the strict sense, get the organizations' perspectives on the vouchering program; we obtained the views of one, or in some cases two, officials whose organizational positions differed. We interviewed one person at 19 schools and 2 persons at the remaining 8 schools. In most of the cases where there were 2 respondents, one provided the bulk of the information obtained with the other corroborating or filling in from time to time. A breakdown of our respondents' positions is shown in Table A1. These respondents were designated by the schools. We believe that they were appropriate persons and that they were capable of speaking for their organizations. Nonetheless, some of their responses very probably reflected personal and positional biases.

Because of considerations pertaining to the protection of the rights of human subjects, Part B information concerning individuals was obtained anonymously when it was obtained at all. That is to say, we do not know the identity of any student for whom we collected school evaluations and reports in the second part of the interview. While this will preclude future matching of information from the schools with information obtained from the students in a separate series of interviews, we felt that the research task did not warrant the breach of privacy which identification of individuals in Part B would have involved.

TABLE A1

POSITIONS OF RESPONDENTS TO SCHOOL SURVEY
(In Percentages)

| Position in Organization | Primary Respondent | Secondary Respondent | All Respondents |
|---|---|---|---|
| Administrator | 37 | 12 | 31 |
| Business Office Representative | 11 | 38 | 17 |
| Registrar | 18 | 38 | 23 |
| Counselor | 11 | 12 | 11 |
| Owner | 22 | - | 17 |
| Total | 99 | 100 | 99 |
| (N) | (27) | (8) | (35) |

We were not able to obtain information on individual students in 22 cases. Anonymity requirements precluded collection of information on individual students enrolled in schools at which fewer than three vouchered WIN students had enrolled (15 cases) and the schools were unable to provide any information on seven students, usually because a student had registered but had had no further contact with the school. Table A2 breaks these cases down by public/private status, size and occupational specialization area of the schools. The most serious gaps in the individual data occur among small schools and personal service schools where 44 and 64 percent of the WIN students respectively were not covered. We cannot therefore, make inferences for these types of schools.

TABLE A2

ANALYSIS OF MISSING PART 9 DATA ON INDIVIDUAL VOUCHERED WIN STUDENTS

| Categories of Schools | No Data Collected | | School Had No Data | | Total Missing Data | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of Cases | Percent of All WIN Students in Category | Number of Cases | Percent of All WIN Students in Category | Number of Cases | Percent of All WIN Students in Category |
| Proprietary Status | | | | | | |
| Public | (1) | 1 | (5) | 7 | (6) | 8 |
| Private | (14) | 14 | (2) | 2 | (16) | 16 |
| Size | | | | | | |
| Small | (11) | 41 | (1) | 4 | (12) | 44 |
| Medium | (3) | 4 | (1) | 1 | (4) | 6 |
| Large | (1) | 1 | (5) | 7 | (6) | 8 |
| Occupational Specialization | | | | | | |
| Multiple | (2) | 3 | (5) | 8 | (7) | 11 |
| Business/Commercial | (6) | 11 | (1) | 2 | (7) | 13 |
| Medical and Dental Allied | (-) | (-) | - | (-) | (-) | (-) |
| Personal Services | (7) | 64 | - | (-) | (7) | (64) |
| Industrial/Transportation | (-) | (-) | (1) | 5 | (1) | 5 |
| Academic | (-) | (-) | (-) | (-) | (-) | (-) |

One school declined to give out performance data on individual students even under conditions of anonymity. Additionally, at one public school there was no centralized location where complete data on individuals could be obtained within the time available (WIN voucher students comprised only 0.2 percent of the total student body of over 17,000 at this school.) This school later collated and provided data on some individuals for a few items, but was unable to do so for the remaining topics. For these reasons, some of the data presented in this report include rather large proportions of "don't know/no answer" responses.

APPENDIX B

Interview Schedules

Part A - Schools Questionnaire
Part B - Individual Voucher Clients

BSSR:538

Schools Questionnaire

The following questions deal with a study of vouchered training which we have been conducting.

In the voucher system, the client in a manpower program is given a certificate (voucher) which entitles him to vocational training in the occupational area of his choice and at the training institution of his choice. In this system, client choice of occupation and school is crucial in contrast to the more traditional manpower training system where these decisions are made by employment counselors or staff persons. _____ was among the training institutions chosen by voucher clients here in the Portland area.

This questionnaire consists of two parts. Part A asks some questions about your school and its programs and contains some general questions about voucher trainees. Part B asks about the individual vouchered students who enrolled in your school under this special program.

Part A

1. Name of school. _____

2. Position of respondent. _____

3. How many instructors and other professionals are on your staff?

   Number of instructors _____

   Number of other professionals _____

4. Does your school have VA approval (i.e., by the state approval agency)?

   Yes. . . . . 0

   No . . . . . 1

5. A. How many students were enrolled here (in vocational training) during the past year?

   Total of students (including manpower students) . . . ____

   B. How many of them were (vocational) students from manpower programs such as MDTA, WIN, or some other program (includes voucher students)?

   Total vocational education students from manpower programs. . . . . ____

6. A. I need to know a bit about your admission procedures. What steps do you normally take in deciding whether to enroll an applicant for vocational training?

| Do you: | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| a. have a general interview with applicant. . . . . | 0 | 1 |
| b. determine prior schooling. . . . . | 0 | 1 |
| c. determine prior work experience. . . . . | 0 | 1 |
| d. examine school transcripts . . . . . | 0 | 1 |
| e. get references from previous employers . . . . . | 0 | 1 |
| f. give general intelligence test — Specify tests _____ . | 0 | 1 |
| g. give educational achievement test — Specify tests _____ . | 0 | 1 |
| h. give occupational aptitude test — Specify tests _____ . | 0 | 1 |
| i. none . . . . . | 0 | 1 |
| j. other. . . . . | 0 | 1 |

B. Are these normal admission proceedures for <u>all</u> (vocational education) applicants or do they vary for different people or different courses?

| | |
|---|---|
| They are normal for all applicants (SKIP TO 7) . . . . . | 0 |
| They vary with individual applicants (GO ON TO 6C) . . . . | 1 |
| They vary with individual courses (GO ON TO 6C). . . . . | 2 |

C. How do admission proceedures vary with individual applicants or courses?

7. A. So far as you know, were there any voucher people who applied here for training but were refused?

Yes. . . . . 0

No (SKIP TO Q.8) . . . 1

B. How many? _____

C. Why were they refused admission? (PROBE FOR INDIVIDUAL REASONS)

8. A. How about your recruitment proceedures? How do you usually go about attracting (vocational education) students? (PROBE FOR METHODS AND MEDIA)

B. Do you have staff persons who specialize in recruiting?

Yes. . . . . 0

No . . . . . 1

C. What do they do?

9. What would you say are the pros and cons of the (vocational) training program here as opposed to a (public/private) school with similar course work?

Now a bit more about your students:

10. A. What is the usual dropout rate among your (vocational training) students?

B. Does this vary with specific occupational areas?

Yes . . . . . 0

No (SKIP TO 11) . 1

C. How does it vary? Why?

11. A. Are dropout rates for students from manpower programs higher, lower, or about the same as for your (vocational training) students in general?

Higher dropout rate for manpower program students. . . . . 0

About the same . . . . . 1

Lower dropout rate for manpower program students . . . . . 2

DNA, no experience with manpower program students. . . . . 3

ASK 113 ONLY AT SCHOOLS WITH 8 OR MORE VOUCHERS: (Mount Hood, Portland Community, Bryman, Western Business, Northwestern College of Business, Technical Training Service)

B. In your experience with the voucher students, are their dropout rates higher, lower, or about the same as for students from manpower programs?

Higher for voucher students. . . . . 0

About the same . . . . . 1

Lower for voucher students . . . . . 2

DNA, no experience with manpower program students. . . . . 3

12. Of all your vocational training students who fail to complete their course work, what proportion are:

a. Asked to leave by the school _____%

b. Dropout of their own volition _____%

13. A. How about attendance in class among the students here who are from manpower programs? Is it higher, or lower, or about the same as for other students?

Higher . . . . . 0

About the same . . . . . 1

Lower . . . . . 2

Can't say, no experience with manpower students . . . . . 3

B. Usually, when a student is from a manpower program, the agency checks periodiacally with the school to verify attendance. Suppose this requirement were to be eliminated. Do you think attendance would go down, or go up, or wouldn't it change?

Attendance would go down . . . . 0

Attendance would go up . . . . . 1

Attendance would not change. . . 2

And about the services you are able to offer your students:

14. Do you provide educational counseling services to your students prior to training?

Yes (briefly describe in space below) . . . . . 0

No . . . . . 1

A. Are they provided during training?

Yes (briefly describe in space below) . . . . . 0

No . . . . . 1

15. Do you provide job search and/or placement services for your students?

Yes (DESCRIBE BELOW AND ASK Q. 15A). . . . . 0

No (SKIP TO Q. 16) . . . . . 1

A. What percentage of all your graduates do you place? _____ %

Now some questions about your experience with the voucher system:

16. A. Did you encounter any major problems with the voucher trainees themselves?

Yes (GO ON TO B). . . . . 0

No (SKIP TO Q. 17). . . . . 1

B. What were they?

17. Were there any particular advantages or difficulties associated with the financing or billing system?

Traditionally, the manpower agency has decided who will get vocational training and also has played a major role in deciding the occupational area and training institution in which the client would be trained.

18. Under the voucher system, however client choice of occupation and school is crucial. How does this system seem to you? (PROBE: Is it better for the agency to do more screening of clients, determine who is best suited for training, and then send them to a school for training via this traditional system, or is it better to have the client made these decisions?

EXPLAIN: DIFFERENTIATE AND BE SURE TO COVER SCREENING, OCCUPATIONAL CHOICE, SCHOOL CHOICE, PROBING IF NECESSARY.

19. A. In the Portland program, limits were put on the cost, length, and type of training for which the voucher could be used. I'd like to ask you about what effects you think the limits might have had. First, the voucher clients could not take training which would last more than a year. How does that limit seem to you? Is it reasonable and realistic, or would it be better to have some other provision? (SAY: for a longer period, or maybe a shorter period. Why do you think that?)

B. Second, the cost of training could not exceed $2500 without special clearance. How do you feel about this? Is this a reasonable limit, or would you suggest some other provision?

C. Finally, the students' vocational choice could not include a vocational or recreational type of training such as golf or swimming. Other than that, vouchers could be used for any occupation at all. What do you think of this provision? Would you suggest changing it in any way?

20. There's been some talk of using vouchers for vocational training on a broader scale, but there are some differences of opinion about the effectiveness of the program. Here is what some people say would happen if the voucher system were to replace the existing one. How about you, do you agree or disagree with these statements. Additional comments are welcome!

| | Agree | Disagree |
|---|---|---|
| A. Manpower clients would make occupational decisions which are just as good as those made by manpower training counselors . . . . . | 0 | 1 |
| B. Decision-making by the client would increase his self-esteem . . . . . | 0 | 1 |
| C. Students would be more comfortable, because it would not be so obvious to school personnel, teachers, or other students that they are "poor" or "on welfare" . | 0 | 1 |
| D. If client, rather than counselors deal with the schools, they will be talked into training that they really don't want or need . . . . . | 0 | 1 |
| E. If clients are left on their own, they may choose occupations for which there is little or no chance of being employed . . . . . | 0 | 1 |
| F. Manpower clients would be able to select a vocational training school just as wisely as the counselors. . . | 0 | 1 |
| G. The voucher system would reduce administrative paper work. . . . . | 0 | 1 |
| H. Decision-making by the client would increase his motivation to successfully complete training. . . . . | 0 | 1 |
| I. Some schools will try to sell training to clients which is not suited to their needs or abilities . . . | 0 | 1 |
| J. Since the training is paid for by the government, the clients may choose expensive schools, even though equally effective training would be available elsewhere at a lower cost . . . . . | 0 | 1 |

Part B--Individual Voucher Clients

Position of respondent _____

1. Client I.D. No. _____

2. Name of school. _____

3. Program in which enrolled _____

4. Did client have another program in mind when (he/she) first applied here?

Yes (GO TO Q. 4A) . . . . . 0

No (SKIP TO Q. 5) . . . . . 1

A. What program was that?

B. If different, why was this change made?

5. Did you make any (other) changes in the training plan such as changing the length, cost, or content specifically for this student? (What? Why, if not obvious?)

Change in length. . . . . 0

Change in cost. . . . . 1

Change in content . . . . . 2

6. What steps, did you take in deciding to admit _____ to training in this vocational area?

☐ Check here if R says same as Q. 6, Part A.

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| a. General interview | 0 | 1 |
| b. Determination of prior schooling | 0 | 1 |
| c. Determination of prior work experience | 0 | 1 |
| d. Examination of prior school transcripts | 0 | 1 |
| e. References from previous employers | 0 | 1 |
| f. General intelligence testing | 0 | 1 |
| g. Educational achievement testing | 0 | 1 |
| h. Occupational aptitude testing | 0 | 1 |
| i. none | 0 | 1 |
| j. other (specify) | 0 | 1 |

7. A. Do you consider his/her occupational choice to be appropriate?

EXPLAIN: IN WHAT WAYS APPROPRIATE OR NOT APPROPRIATE. PROBE FOR ABILITIES, BACKGROUND LABOR MARKET DEMAND, ETC.

Appropriate (SKIP TO Q. 8) . . . . . 0

Not appropriate (GO ON TO Q. 7B) . . . 1

B. Did you take any action to advise or assist the student in making a more suitable choice? (PROBE)

IF NOT ALREADY ASCERTAINED:

8. Did you provide educational/training counseling services to this student prior to or during training?

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| Prior to training. . . . . | 0 | 1 |
| During training. . . . . | 0 | 1 |

9. A. What about his/her choice of schools? Do you think that your training program is best suited for _____ or would it be better if he/she were somewhere else?

EXPLAIN: AND IF BETTER ELSEWHERE, WHERE AND WHY.

B. Did client attend classes here?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes. . . . . | 0 |
| No . . . . . | 1 |

IF CLIENT NEVER ATTENDED, CHECK HERE ☐ AND TERMINATE INTERVIEW

10. How would you say that _____ compares(ed) to other (vocational training) students here in terms of the following:

| Would you say average, above average, or below average? | Above Average | Average | Below Average |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. class performance | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| b. general aptitudes and abilities | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| c. preparation for training | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| d. attendance | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| e. interest | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| f. motivation | 0 | 1 | 2 |

11. Is trainee still in training, has he/she completed, or did he/she leave before finishing?

Still in training (SKIP TO Q. 13) . . . . . 0

Completed training (SKIP TO Q. 13) . . . . 1

Left before finishing (GO ON TO Q. 12) . . 2

12. Was trainee asked to leave by the school, or did he/she drop out on his/her own.

Asked to leave by school (GO ON TO Q. 12A) . . . 0

Left on own (SKIP TO Q. 12B) . . . . . 1

12. A. Why was trainee asked to leave? DO NOT READ--USE AS CHECKLIST

DO NOT READ--USE AS CHECKLIST AND PROBE IF NECESSARY

a. Poor class performance . . . . . 0
b. Lacked aptitudes and abilities . . . . . 1
c. Poor attendance. . . . . 2
d. Lacked interest. . . . . 3
e. Lacked motivation. . . . . 4
f. Other (specify). . . . . 5

SKIP TO Q. 16

B. What reason did the student give for leaving?

DO NOT READ--USE AS CHECKLIST

Course work was too dificult. . . . . 0
Needed an income (job). . . . . 1
Just preferred working to attending school. . . . . 2
Decided against this occupation . . . . . 3
Had family or personal problems . . . . . 4
Transportation problems . . . . . 5
Gave no reason. . . . . 6
Other (specify) . . . . . 7

SKIP TO Q. 16

---

FOR THOSE WHO HAVE COMPLETED TRAINING ONLY. FOR STUDENTS STILL IN TRAINING, SKIP TO Q. 17.

13. Did (trainee) receive a degree or certificate upon completion of this program?

Yes (DESCRIBE AND GET NAME OF DOCUMENT) . . . . 0

No. . . . . 1

14. A. Did trainee get placement assistance when he/she finished?

Yes (GO TO Q. 14C) . . . . . 0

No (SKIP TO Q. 14B). . . . . 1

B. Did the trainee get a job?

Yes (SKIP TO Q. 15). . . . . 0

No (SKIP TO Q. 16) . . . . . 1

DK (SKIP TO Q. 16) . . . . . 2

DNA (SKIP TO Q. 16). . . . . 3

C. What type of assistance? PROBE

D. Did the trainee get a job?

Yes (GO ON TO Q. 14E). . . . . 0

No (SKIP TO Q. 16) . . . . . 1

DK (SKIP TO Q. 16) . . . . . 2

E. Did the trainee get the job with your (school's) assistance or did he/she find it on his/her own?

With school's assistance . . . . 0

Found on own . . . . . 1

15. Have you had any feedback from the trainee's employer?

Yes (specify content). . . . . 0

No . . . . . 1

16. Use this space for any additional comments concerning the client and/or the program.

---

FOR STUDENTS STILL IN TRAINING ONLY:

17. Will trainee receive a degree or certificate upon completion of this program?

Yes (DESCRIBE AND GET NAME OF DOCUMENT) . . . . 0

No. . . . . 1

18. Will trainee get placement assistance when he/she finishes?

Yes (ASK Q. 14A) . . . . . 0

No (SKIP TO Q. 16) . . . . . 1

14. A. What type of assistance?

19. Use this space for any additional comments on the client and/or the program.

APPENDIX C

SPECIFIC VOCATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS IN WHICH
VOUCHERED WIN STUDENTS WERE ENROLLED

PROFESSIONAL/TECHNICAL

Accounting
Data Processing
Data Processing, executive and management
Nursing
Nursing Assistant
Occupational Therapy Technician
Operating Room Technician
Medical Assistant
Dental Technician
Dental Assistant
Medical Records Technician
Anthropology, academic
Psychology, academic
Social Science, academic
Biology, academic
Broadcast Management and Announcing
Commercial Art
Audio-visual Technician

MANAGEMENT/ADMINISTRATIVE

Business Management
Medical Management

CLERICAL

Clerk-Typist
Secretaries
- general
- executive
- professional
- medical
- legal
- automation
- broadcast
- airlines

Receptionists
- general
- professional
- medical

Keypunch
Bookkeeping-Keypunch
Bookkeeping
Library Assistant

OPERATIVES, Except Transportation

Automotive, mechanics and related
Diesel Mechanic
Welding
Upholstering

TRANSPORTATION OPERATIVES

Truck Driving

PERSONAL SERVICES

Child Care Aide
Food Preparation
Barbering
Beauty Operator

OTHER

Landscaping
Forestry

---

NOTE: Names of programs differ slightly from school to school. Includes only programs reported by schools from which data on individual vouchered WIN students were collected.